

BULLETIN

University of Kentucky

University Extension Series

December, 1922

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR SOLDIERS



Entered as second class matter, February 2, 1922, at the Post Office at Lexington, Kentucky, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 13, 1922.

Volume 1

No. 8

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR SOLDIERS

A Debate Handbook

By

EARL EMERY FLEISCHMAN, A. B., ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH,
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SPEAKING, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE
FREE PUBLIC
LIBRARY

Published by the University of Kentucky

UB
373
.F6
1922

Copyright 1922,
By the University of Kentucky

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LIBRARY
KENTON, KY.

Preface

This pamphlet is published purely as a handbook for debaters. Neither the author nor the University of Kentucky has any interest in the question. It is published in response to demand for debating material on a subject which is being discussed widely at the present time. The arguments for and against purport merely to be possible lines of argument or points that may be proved, and as suggestions for debate. The bulletin attempts to present the question from an outside viewpoint and it is not to be interpreted that the author or the University has any interest in the outcome either for or against the question under discussion. A debaters' handbook necessarily attempts to present the viewpoint of both sides of the issue, and attempts, so far as possible, to balance the discussion. In this spirit, this handbook is presented.

The Soldiers' Bonus

Resolved, That adjusted compensation embodying the four-fold optional plan offered by the American Legion should be granted to our soldiers of the World War by the Congress now in session.

Several factors led to the selection of this question for our debating series for this year. First, it is a pertinent, insistent question, a really live issue which has yet to be disposed of by the American people. Although the Fordney-McCumber bill failed in the Senate to pass over the President's veto, the margin was so slight that its advocates are sure to force it to a place of importance in the legislative program of the 68th Congress. After the partial referendum of the elections, these supporters of the bill will renew their efforts to secure its passage. The American Legion in national convention at New Orleans in October (1922) renewed its pledge to this cause and will be unceasing in its demands that a final decision be handed down to the soldiers from the American people.

It is a much mooted and misunderstood question. So much prejudice on the one hand and sentiment on the other has prompted much of this discussion that the truth as far as the public is concerned has been obscured. Much of what the newspapers have written is propaganda, political, industrial or factional—a cloud through which the real issues are but dimly seen. The fight over the measure in Congress has been denounced again and again as contemptible political chicanery, making the war veterans the victims of a huge joke—the adjusted compensation measure a mere pawn for the accomplishment of immediate political aims. As a result, the American people of the average community are left in doubt as to the real merits of the case.

If a debate serves any real purpose, it is that of bringing before the popular audience a logical, balanced discussion of vital issues, affecting them as individuals. The charge often has been made against the formal debate in schools that it is a purely detached, academic exercise for matching wits in argu-

ment. If that has been true, it is because we have not taken vital questions home to the people—problems which are calling for solution in some practical, common sense way. While the average high school student can not be expected to offer satisfactory solutions for those problems that perplex and baffle our leaders, he is able and eager to study such questions as the one selected which touches him almost directly through his own family or friends or kin among whom it is likely some veteran of the World War will be found. Aside from its nearness to the individual interests of members of every community, it presents an excellent opportunity for realizing the moral value which comes from casting aside personal feeling or desire and finding the truth of the matter.

If an obligation to the nation's defenders exists, the people no doubt are willing and even eager to meet it. But if no such claim is due, they and the ones who would benefit from it have a right to know the truth. The people who, when all is said and done, must pay the bill are the ones to determine such a question and to pass upon it. The members of each local American Legion Post should be brought face to face with the truth, whatever that is and accept it willingly and without resentment should the claim be found unwarranted. The principle of public discussion is a democratic, American principle which these debates should aim in some measure to realize. Upon such a question as the one chosen, the debates will take on the manner of the public discussion of a much disputed issue in an effort to get to the facts in the case and to establish the right. In this way, we hope to make these debates useful to the local communities and not merely an academic means for training students in thinking and speaking.

It is possible that one or two objections might be urged against this question by those who voted against it when it was first submitted.

The first difficulty is that of obtaining judges. It might be claimed that the bonus question is a political issue and also one over which a great deal of feeling has been aroused and around which considerable predisposed prejudice clings. As to the

former, it may be said that the recent vote in the House and Senate, divided as it was on non-partisan lines, is an indication that the only political significance that the proposition has is that it was used and is likely to be used again as a pawn for re-election. This should not affect the problem of judges in the local communities. In the latter case, while feeling upon the issue is quite pronounced, it is not unlike other questions like immigration and labor disputes where sympathies contend with logical judgment. The matter of judges is always a difficult one but there is no help out of the situation except in a wise choice, the responsibility for which rests upon the schools involved. Many men can be found whose judgment upon such a question will depend upon the strength of the arguments and not upon personal feeling or opinion.

The other objection which might be raised is that of the scarcity of material. In answer, it may be said first that all questions that are new have that fault while many older questions have the more obvious objection of too much material and a monotonous repetition which has made them threadbare as far as original thought is concerned.

On our hypothesis for these debates there is little gained in the public discussion of an old question—a question very often beyond the capacity of high school students although it may furnish abundant material. And for the students, half the value of debating is in the training afforded in gathering facts and thinking out the relations which exist between them. If these facts can be read out of a book placed in the student's hands, what does he gain beyond an ability as a phonograph record to repeat what someone else has thought and written? We desire to stimulate and encourage the initiative of the student to go out and find the facts that he needs. That is a quality much demanded in our modern life. On such a question as adjusted compensation he has to do what every other citizen who wants to find out about it is compelled to do. He has to go to the sources of that information—no reports and bulletins where figures are to be juggled—but just plain evidence from the facts and from authority.

There are adequate sources for this information. The national organization of the American Legion is willing and able to give any available affirmative material. Through the cooperation of local posts, it is possible to get access to files of the American Legion Weekly and The Stars and Stripes which contain many articles bearing directly upon the proposed measure. Trade journals like the Wall Street Journal and the Financial Chronicle have published several articles useful to the negative. The files of newspapers will also furnish usable material. Through the Readers' Guide, the student may find special articles in current magazines. Many of these are listed in the bibliography offered in the bulletin. Most important of all is the Congressional Record's account of the proceedings and discussions incident to the adjusted compensation measure. By enlisting the aid of Congressmen and the cooperation of local libraries with the Library of Congress, one will not find it difficult to obtain abundant material. The Government Printing Office will furnish many of these articles separately at a nominal cost. Many of these are listed in this bulletin.

One distinct advantage, especially for the smaller school, is that the same material is available for all and can be obtained at small cost, much of it for the asking. The purpose of this bulletin is to give a general analysis and discussion of the proposition and to point to the sources of information. While the statements in this bulletin are, we believe, substantially correct, they should not be accepted as final. However, whenever the bulletin is used as the source of information, it should be credited by the debater as the authority from which his statement is quoted either directly or indirectly.

As for the other material, it should be sifted carefully and the authorities given for the statements thoroughly tested for their knowledge, fairness, and reliability. Unusual care should be exercised on this point because of the fact that much of the discussion in the Congressional Record, newspapers and magazines is colored by private interests and political motives.

THE MEANING OF THE PROPOSITION

The question for debate is adjusted compensation to soldiers of the World War. By adjusted compensation is meant a sum in cash or its equivalent as extra or back pay for military services to the country during the war. The need for such an adjustment had its origin in the alleged economic inequalities existing between the men who followed the colors and those who remained at home upon the return of the former to civil life.

The question of a bonus has no legitimate place in this debate. Although the adjusted compensation measure popularly has been referred to as "The Bonus," it is a misnomer. A bonus is a gratuity awarded to an individual or group out of appreciation for services rendered. The government granted such a bonus, amounting to \$60 in cash, to our victorious soldiers as a tribute to their courage and sacrifice. It was a thank-offering springing from the hearts of the people. Commendable and right as it was, that bonus or any other bonus is extraneous to the present discussion.

The granting of a bonus does not discharge an obligation if that obligation is bona fide. In this debate the issue is over adjusted compensation, which implies such an obligation. It is impossible for any individual to lay claim to a bonus unless that bonus was part of an agreement, to be paid for an understood consideration. The soldier had no such agreement unless the extravagant promises of a country in time of war be interpreted as such. *The only claim that has been filed against the government by the veterans of this war is that sponsored by the American Legion, which is a claim for adjusted compensation, not a bonus. Upon the merits of this claim the issues of this debate are founded.

The amount of that compensation is not an issue in this debate except that it is understood that it should be adequate to administer economic justice and to adjust the inequalities of the war.

*The American Legion has approximately 1,000,000,000 active members at the present time.

THE FOUR-FOLD PLAN OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Upon the request of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Commander of the American Legion submitted the following plan for payment. The choice of one of the four features is to be optional with the soldier.

1. "Land settlement, covering farms in all states, and not confined to a few states.
2. "Home aid, to encourage purchase of homes in either country or city.
3. "Vocational training for all ex-service persons desiring it.
4. "Adjustment of compensation or final adjustment of extra back pay based on length of service for those not desiring to avail themselves of any one of the previous three features."

Subsequently, the Legion proposed the creation of a revolving fund to which members of the Legion not needing or not desiring benefit under any one of these plans might contribute their share of adjusted compensation to the end that the fund might be used to assist in caring for their physically disabled comrades. This last suggestion is without the bounds of the issues of this debate. It is to be admitted by both affirmative and negative that the matter of how the money is to be spent or whether a service man accepts his compensation or not is not within the province of this debate. The government can exercise no authority over an individual's personal rights and does not care to do so. If such compensation is awarded the service man will be left free to make what disposition of his privilege seems best to him.

Further, it is understood from the statement of the proposition that the question is one for immediate settlement. If such an obligation exists, which is one of the issues of this debate, it is evident that nothing is to be gained by an indefinite postponement. On the other hand, if the claim is unfounded, the service men who have advanced the claim should be given a definite, decisive answer and not have their hopes bolstered up by indefinite promises for the future. Therefore, it is the meaning of the question to have the issue brought up in the 68th Congress and an immediate decision reached upon it—a decision which will leave no doubt in the minds of the claimants

as to the position of the government. In simple terms, the question is that of adjusting the veteran's pay during the war on an equal basis with that of the civilian by giving him his choice of cash endowment policy, land settlement, home or farm aid and vocational training.

THE HISTORY OF QUESTION

Since the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918, the rapid discharge of men of the citizen army who were enlisted for the term of the war and their return to civil life, this has been an issue demanding more and more of public attention and interest. *The soldier who returned from the training camps and from overseas, is a different man in many respects from the one who left his job a year or two before. He marched to the colors amid the cheers of the throngs and with the extravagant promises of a people intoxicated with patriotic fervor ringing in his ears. He went to fight for an ideal, leaving behind him a people who cherished that ideal, in short, the United States of 1917. He returned to civil life when all cheering had subsided and when the people had returned each to his own work in an effort to make up for lost time and reap the rich rewards which seemed nearer to his grasp than ever before. The soldier found himself facing the task of getting back on the old basis and taking his place shoulder to shoulder with America's Industrial Army. In spite of his bewilderment at the relapse of his country to the old ways and the ease with which they forgot their promises, he bravely began the struggle to adjust himself to the new conditions in which he found himself and to become self-supporting, a task for which he soon discovered the war tended to unfit him.

For war is a reversion to the primitive. At least, it requires a simplicity of thought and life. The soldier is a creature of the moment, blindly trusting the judgment of his superiors to care for him and taking his orders from above without

*The psychology of the war veteran given is that offered by former National Commander of the Legion, Hanford MacNider, in *Current History* for July. It is a sympathetic view but one purporting to represent the typical attitude of the common soldier. It is submitted here merely as a part of the history of the question.

question. It is a discipline affording courage and endurance to physical hardships, to danger, pain and death but hardly suited to the needs of modern civil life where success depends upon individual initiative and a sense of responsibility.

Consequently, the service man not only saw the folks back home in a new light, but he was made conscious of his own inequality to cope with them in the pursuits of civil life. Moreover, he was conscious of a kind of spiritual regeneration as the result of his experience which he reasoned made him fit for a better citizenship than he had fallen heir to. No doubt, it expressed itself in some men in their disinclination to return to the old jobs but to follow an ambition to carve out a new place for themselves, a place for which the war had rather disqualified than fitted them. However, it had a greater significance than that. It sprang from a devotion to country made possible by heroic sacrifice and without the experience of those who remained at home. The service man did expect to take a larger place in the nation's life—a privilege to which his service seemed to entitle him. However, he found that he was unable to assume such a place because of economic pressure, aggravated by the financial depression of 1920-1921.

He found that in addition to his actual loss in earnings during the war, he suffered a much greater loss in potential earning power. The man who stayed at home was not only ahead in actual receipts and savings but was secure in his place of advantage, economically. This seemed an inequality too unjust to be permitted to exist. He sought relief in the hope that an adjustment of compensation would be made. Mindful of the promises of the nation during the war, he looked for such a relief measure as a natural right.

Such an idea apparently was present in the minds of those service men who attended the first national convention of the Legion in Minneapolis, November, 1919, when they adopted the following resolution:

"The American Legion recognizes that our government has an obligation to all service men and women to relieve the financial disadvantages incident to their military service—an obligation second only to that of caring for the disabled and for widows and

orphans of those who sacrificed their lives, and one already acknowledged by our Allies, but the American Legion feels that it cannot ask for legislation in its selfish interest, and leaves with confidence to Congress, the discharge of this obligation."

Meanwhile, many bills were introduced in Congress having as their purpose the adjustment of compensation. The presentation of such bills began under the Wilson Administration.

Soon the Republican members of the House called a caucus and adopted a resolution recommending that the rules committee submit a rule authorizing the Speaker to refer all soldier benefit legislation to the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule was passed and thereafter the Committee on Ways and Means has taken care of all such bills. This committee requested the American Legion to appear before it. Whereupon the Commander declared its committee ready to submit recommendations for legislation. These recommendations substantially were incorporated in the bill which passed the House in May, 1920. It provided for a cash bonus to all soldiers of the war under the rank of Captain, \$1.25 a day for each day's service after the first sixty. Civilian employees, contract surgeons, men dishonorably discharged, conscientious objectors and those granted farm or industrial furloughs were excluded from the benefits of the bill. The eligible candidate was given the privilege of electing instead of cash payment, one of the following plans: (1) farm or home aid, (2) paid up endowment insurance, (3) vocational training, (4) land settlement. For each of the first three, the credit due was computed at \$1.75 a day for the term of service exclusive of the first sixty days. The measure at that time was permitted to die a natural death because the administration declared itself opposed to it. Secretary of Treasury Houston made a "strong, consistent and able argument" against it. Altogether, it was thought best to carry it to the people in the Presidential election in November of the same year.

During the campaign which followed, adjusted compensation received consideration from both parties. The Democrats in their National Convention at San Francisco discussed the

question in committee and on the floor and voted it out of their platform.

The Republicans, while ignoring the issue at their National Convention, committed themselves to its support through their candidate, Mr. Harding, in the following campaign. The following extract is taken from a speech which he delivered in Cincinnati just before the election and which was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer, October 30, 1920:

"Well, I am very happy to say to you that the House passed the bonus bill and the Senate has it under consideration and I have no doubt the Senate will pass it. I myself think it ought to pass if you want to know my views."

On July 5, 1921, the Senate revived the issue and voted to take up the bonus bill presented by the Finance Committee, a bill similar to the one passed by the House, the preceding year. The bill provided for adjusted payment based on length of service, to become operative July 1, 1922, and offered five options, (1) adjusted service payment in cash installments, (2) certificates calling for deferred payments, increased by interest, (3) vocational training aid, (4) farm or home aid, (5) land settlement. Estimates of the total cost varied from \$1,500,000,-000 to \$5,250,000,000.

On July 6, a letter from Secretary of Treasury Mellon to Senator Freylinghuysen (Rep., N. J.) was read in the Senate. The secretary said, that the proposed disbursements "could be financed only by adding to the burden of debt and taxes under which the country is now staggering" and would introduce "grave complications into the refunding operations which will be necessary within the next few years."

Meanwhile, the urgent desire of many Senators opposing the measure was voiced to the President in private conference. Finally, on July 12, he appeared in person before the Senate to urge the return of the bill to the Finance Committee stating that its enactment "in the midst of a struggle for readjustment and restoration would hinder every effort and greatly imperil the financial stability of the country." After a heated debate,

the Senate on July 15, voted to recommit the bill. So the bill again went into winter quarters.

However, Chairman Fordney of the House was unconvinced that it could not be done. He believed that Congress could "find a way to raise the money." As a result, during the remainder of 1921 and the beginning of 1922 the champions of compensation sought various means of raising the money. Sentiment throughout the country was crystalizing as a result of the organized effort of the American Legion and the Republican caucus saw the advisability of hastening action before the year's elections. The President went on record as favoring a bonus and committed himself to approving such a measure, provided a means for creating a fund from which payment could be made were added. He advocated a sales tax. Other special taxes were proposed such as that on cigarettes, gasoline and amusements favored by Secretary Mellon, continuation of the excess profits tax, increased income tax, tax on bank checks, documents, increased postage, automobile license tax and a score of others. A storm of protest arose from the quarters affected by each proposal in turn, creating a tide of disapproval of the whole bonus measure. Other suggestions for securing the funds to pay the bill met a similar fate. The proposal that the measure be financed from the interest on the war loans was defeated by Secretary Mellon's declaration that this fund was pledged by law to redeem the Liberty Bonds. The President was known to be opposed to a bond issue, and payment could not be made from the Treasury because no money was there for which drafts had not been made, and the Treasury was facing a deficit and the necessity of asking for a deficiency appropriation to cover it. As a consequence the special joint committee composed of Senators McCumber and Smoot and Representatives Longworth and Copeley found themselves in a deadlock, unable to go on or to retrace their steps.

Meanwhile, American Legion leaders, meeting in conference in Indianapolis, January 20, 1921, had adopted a resolution commending President Harding and the Cabinet "for the

stand they are now taking in recognizing the merit of the Legion's optional adjusted compensation bill as a constructive measure of prime importance."

As the 67th session of Congress drew near its close, the urge to take some action upon the adjusted compensation measure became more and more apparent. As one Senator expressed it, "We're between the devil and the deep sea. The ex-service men are organized and will wield a tremendous power in politics this autumn. The opposition is not organized but it is finding a way to make known its disapproval. The trouble about the whole thing is that members of Congress have been influenced by their own political ambitions and have disregarded the economic aspects of the problem." On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that the consistent advocates of adjusted compensation in the House and Senate have been actuated by the purest motives. While in their zeal to secure its passage they no doubt took advantage of the popular pressure being exerted upon many of the opponents of the bill, let it be said in justice to them that they were moved by a desire "to keep a sacred pledge and to perform a recognized obligation." Senator McCumber, leader of the bill in the Senate, answered the charge "that such legislation is being urged as a bid for the soldier's vote" in the following way.

"The absolute silliness of this contention is apparent. Let the soldier look over the list of those who have voted for this measure and see if he can find any partisanship in the vote. Let him see if he does not find as many Democrats as Republicans ready to do him this partial justice. He will see that no matter what party advantage may be attempted by individuals, the Congress of the United States in voting this compensation has acted as it did in war as an American Congress and not as a partisan Congress."

Still confronted with the problem of meeting the objections of the Secretary of the Treasury and the President to any bill which made further demands upon the treasury, Chairman Fordney was casting about for a solution satisfactory to all concerned. The payment in cash was the chief obstacle. It would mean five billion dollars, according to some estimates, and created a storm of disapproval from the press which charged a raid

upon the Treasury by soldiers who would "blow" their money in a fortnight. Representative R. G. Fitzgerald of Ohio, an ex-service man, proposed to Mr. Fordney the granting of Treasury Certificates, dated January 1, 1923, bearing $4\frac{1}{2}$ -6 per cent interest and negotiable among the beneficiaries. Finally, a compromise measure was prepared which provided for the adjusted service certificate, postponing payment for twenty years and increasing the amount with interest.

This compromise measure, although not providing for a special means of financing, was expected to meet with the approval of the President because it postponed payment of the major part until a time when the nation would be able to pay from its normal treasury receipts. It passed the House March 23, by a vote of 333-70.

It was then referred to the Senate Finance Committee. After making several changes, rejecting the paid-up life insurance option, striking out the reclamation plan and providing against forfeiture of a soldier's claim through failure to redeem his adjusted service certificate and after a hard fight that included public hearings at which Commander MacNider argued for quick action, the bill was favorably reported June 8, and placed on the Senate Calendar. According to a special ruling June 20, the Senate voted 52-8 to take up the Compensation Bill as soon as the tariff was disposed of with the provision that at any time, by a majority vote, the tariff might be displaced and the Compensation Bill acted upon immediately.

During this fight in Congress and in the Senate the United States Chamber of Commerce led in the opposition from the country at large. After giving a referendum of the question to the chambers throughout the United States the National Chamber stated that a 12 per cent majority of its membership was opposed to the act. However, it was pointed out by Senator Capper of Kansas in a speech before the Senate August 29, 1922, that but 55 per cent of the Chamber's membership voted and a large proportion of these votes came from the large centers of industry like New York and Philadelphia. He said:

"In spite of this, only one proposition out of the four received less votes in favor than it did against and of the total votes on the four propositions submitted 4,116 votes were cast in favor of all bonus propositions to 2,657 against them."

The popular poll which the Literary Digest took among its readers in July and August indicated a slightly greater number (466,814) in favor than opposed (444,221), although disapproval was quite clearly marked in some of the returns. The Legion Weekly points out, however, that the question put to 10,000,000 voters was "Do you favor a Federal *Bonus* for all American soldiers who wore the uniform during the World War?" and not adjusted compensation to a restricted number.

Manifestly it was a strongly divided issue making it difficult for the leaders in Congress to know just what to do.

Finally on September 15, taking advantage of the provision agreed upon, the Senate passed the bill 47-22. On September 19, 1919, the President promptly vetoed the bill, contrary to general expectation altho in keeping with his known attitude, returning the measure to Congress with his reasons for the veto. The House vote overriding the veto was an overwhelming two-thirds, 258-54, but the Senate failed by 4 votes to make up the necessary fraction. The vote was 44-28. All these votes were taken on non-party lines.

THE FORDNEY-McCUMBER BILL

The bill vetoed by the President offered one of the following optional plans to a member of the military and naval forces of the United States at any time during the period after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918, except those above the rank of captain or its equivalent, civilian officers and employees, contract surgeons, commissioned or warrant officers performing home service not with troops and receiving commutation of quarters or of subsistence, a member of the Public Health Service as long as he was not detailed for duty with the Army or Navy, an individual granted a farm or industrial furlough for period of the furlough, an individual detailed for work on highway construction or repairs where his pay was equalized to con-

form with that of civilian employees: (1) Adjusted service pay in cash to those whose adjusted service credit would not amount to more than \$50; (2) An adjusted service certificate for 125% of the adjusted service credit in the form of an endowment policy maturing in 20 years and drawing interest at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ compounded annually, amounting to approximately 3.015 times the adjusted service credit; (3) The payment of 140% of the adjusted service credit at the rate of \$1.75 for each day of attendance upon a course in vocational training; (4) Payment by the Secretary of Interior of 125% of the adjusted service credit for the specific purpose of applying on the purchase or improvement of a home or farm and of paying off existing indebtedness.

The adjusted service credit of the applicant is computed by allowing for each day of active service between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1919, in excess of sixty days, \$1.25 for each day of overseas service, and \$1.00 for each day of home service with a limit total of \$625 for the former and \$500 for the latter. In other words, by subtracting sixty days from the total time of service within the special period and multiplying the remainder by the rate per day according to the place of the service at home or overseas the product would be the individual's adjusted service credit. This credit is increased 25% in option No. 2, 40% in option No. 3, and 25% in option No. 4.

The adjusted service certificate plan, since it was the center against which the President's veto disapproval was directed, needs further detailed explanation. The face value of the certificate which is approximately 3.015 times the adjusted service credit is to be paid to the veteran at the expiration of twenty-years or upon the death of the veteran prior to the expiration of the 20 year period, to the beneficiary named. In the meantime, after January 1, 1923, the veteran may use his certificate as security for a loan of 50% of the loan basis. The loan basis is computed by adding to the adjusted service credit interest at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}\%$, compounded annually from the date of the certificate to the date of the loan. Any national bank or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of a state

or territory is authorized to make a loan to any veteran upon his promissory note secured by his adjusted service certificate. The bank is permitted to charge interest at a rate not to exceed 2% more than the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of commercial paper by the Federal Reserve Bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. These notes secured by the certificates are negotiable and may be sold, discounted or rediscounted with any bank which comes under the law and the certificate transferred to such bank. The veteran must be notified of such a transfer.

If the veteran fails to pay the principal and interest of the loan in 6 months after maturity the bank holding the note and certificate may present it to the Secretary of the Treasury between August 31, 1925, and January 15, 1926, and receive payment of principal and accrued interest at the rate fixed in the note up to the date of payment. The veteran can redeem his certificate from the Secretary by paying the amount paid to the bank for the cancellation of the note plus interest on that amount at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$, compounded annually up to the date of the redemption. If the veteran dies leaving a loan unpaid, the Secretary cancels the note by paying the bank as before and then deducts that amount from the face of the certificate, the remainder being the amount due the beneficiary named.

This arrangement is in force until January 1, 1926. After that date postmasters of first, second, or third class will receive applications, make loans and collect payments, cooperating with the Secretary of Treasury in a similar manner to the banks. The following changes may be noted: (1) The interest is fixed at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ per annum; (2) The payments may be made in a fixed number of annual installments, sufficient to extinguish the debt in an agreed period; (3) The amount of the loans will vary from 50% of the loan basis within three years from the date of the certificate, 85% after 3 years but within 6 years, to 70% after 6 years from the date of the certificate.

The veteran will lose his certificate in two cases only: (1) If he fails to redeem it before its maturity; (2) If he is in default of any amount due and such default continues to his death.

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

"If an obligation were to be admitted, it would be to charge the adjusted compensation bill with inadequacy and stinginess wholly unbecoming our Republic. Such a bestowal, to be worth while, must be generous and without apology. Clearly the bill returned herewith takes cognizance of the inability of the government wisely to bestow and says, in substance: 'We do not have the cash; we do not believe in a cash levy to meet the situation, but here is our note; you may have our credit for half its worth,' the bill has been enacted without even a suggested means of meeting the cost. Indeed the cost is not definitely known, either for the immediate future or in the ultimate settlement. The Treasury estimates, based on what seems the most likely exercise of the options, figure the direct cost at approximately \$145,000,000 for 1923, \$225,000,000 for 1924, \$114,000,000 for 1925, \$312,000,000 for 1926, making a total cost in excess of \$4,000,000,000. No estimate of the large indirect cost ever has been made. The certificate plan sets up no reserve against the ultimate liability. The plan avoids any considerable direct outlay by the Government during the earlier years of the bill's proposed operations, but the loans on the certificates would be floated on the credit of the Nation. This is borrowing on the Nation's credit just as truly as tho the loans were made by direct government borrowing and involves a dangerous abuse of public credit. Moreover, the certificate plan of payment is little less than certified inability of the government to pay, and invites a practice in sacrificial barter which I can not sanction.

"It is worth remembering that the public credit is founded on the popular belief in the defensibility of public expenditure as well as the Government's ability to pay. Loans come from every rank in life, and our heavy tax burdens reach, directly or indirectly, every element in our citizenship. To add one-sixth of the total sum of our public debt for distribution among less than 5,000,000 out of 110,000,000 whether inspired by grateful sentiment or political expediency, would undermine the confidence on which our credit is builded and establish the precedent of distributing public funds whenever the proposal and the numbers affected make it seem politically appealing to do so.

"Congress clearly appraised the danger of borrowing directly to finance a bestowal which is without obligation and manifestly recognized the financial problems with which the nation is confronted. . . . The undying gratitude is the meed of everyone who served, it is not to be said that a material bestowal is an obligation to those who emerged from the great conflict not only unharmed, but physically, mentally and spiritually richer for the great experience."

ADMITTED PROPOSITIONS

In this debate, it is admitted that the government is obligated to its defenders who suffered and are still suffering from injury and disease. The government has recognized this obligation and has acknowledged it in the work of the Veterans' Bureau. The President in his veto message said of these:

"It is not to be denied that the Nation has certain very binding obligations to those of its defenders who made real sacrifices in the World War, and who left the armies injured, disabled, or diseased so that they could not resume their places in the normal activities of life. These obligations are being gladly and generously met. Perhaps there are here and there inefficiencies and injustices, and some distressing instances of neglect, but they are all unintentional and every energy is being directed to their earliest possible correction. In meeting this obligation there is no complaint about the heavy cost. In the current fiscal year we are expending \$510,000,000 on hospitalization and care of sick and wounded, on compensation and vocational training for the disabled, and for insurance. The figures do not include the more than \$35,000,000 in process of expenditure on hospital construction. The estimated expenses for the year to follow are approximately \$470,000,000 and the figures may need to be made larger. Though the peak in hospitalization may have passed, there is a growth in domiciliation and the discharge in full of our obligations to the diseased, disabled, or dependent who have a right to the Government's care, with insurance liability added, will probably reach a total sum in excess of \$25,000,000,000.

"More than 99,000 veterans are now enrolled in some of the 445 different courses in vocational training. Fifty-four thousand of them are in schools or colleges, more than 38,000 are in industrial establishments, and a few more than 6,000 are being trained in schools operated by the Veterans' Bureau.

"Approximately 19,000 have completed their courses and have employment in all cases where they desire it, and 53,000 have deferred for the present time their acceptance of training. The number eligible under the law may reach close to 400,000 and facilities will continue to be afforded unmindful of the necessary cost, until every obligation is fulfilled.

"Two hundred and seventy-six thousand patients have been hospitalized, more than a quarter of a million discharged, and 25,678 patients are in our hospitals today.

"Four hundred and sixteen thousand awards of compensation have been made on account of death or disability, and \$480,000,000 have been paid to disabled men or their dependent relatives. One hundred and seventy-five thousand disabled ex-service men are now receiving compensation along with medical or hospital care where needed, and a quarter of a million checks go out monthly in distributing the \$8,000,000 payment on indisputable obligations."

It is further admitted that the Government has acknowledged a later obligation which (in the language of the President's veto message)

"Will have to be met when the younger veterans of today shall contribute to the rolls of the aged, indigent and dependent. It is as inevitable as that the years will pass that pension provision for World War Veterans will be made, as it has been made for those who served in previous wars. . . . The contemplation of such a policy is in accord with the established practice of the Nation, and puts the service men of the World War on the same plane as millions of men who fought the previous battles of the Republic."

Both the affirmative and negative in this debate must also recognize that the granting of a bonus or special compensation for war service is not without precedent in our history. George Washington was granted 3,000 acres of land in what is now Miami County, Ohio, by his native State of Virginia in compensation for his services in the Revolution. He relinquished all claims for his services upon the payment by an act of Congress of \$64,415 for his personal expenses.

Lafayette in 1794 was granted \$24,424 for "pay and emoluments while in the service of the United States" under a special act of Congress. Upon Lafayette's return to the United States for his farewell visit, Congress granted him another bonus of \$200,000, and 200,000 acres of land in Florida.

Washington further urged in a letter written on June 18, 1783, to the Governors of the thirteen states, compensation of all fighting men in the Revolutionary War:

"Where is the man who wishes to remain indebted for the defense of his own person and property by the exertions, the bravery and the blood of others, without making as generous effort to pay the debt of honor and gratitude? In what part of the continent shall be found any man, or any body of men, who would not blush to stand up and propose measures calculated to rob the soldier of his stipend and the public creditor of his due? And were it possible that such an instance of injustice could ever happen, would it not excite the general indignation and tend to bring down upon the authors of such measures the aggravated vengeance of Heaven?

"As to the idea which, I am informed, has in some instances prevailed that the half pay and commutation are to be regarded merely in the odious light of a pension, it ought to be exploded forever; that provision should be reviewed as it really was a reasonable compensation offered by Congress at a time they had nothing else to give to officers of the army for services to be performed; it was the only means to prevent a total dereliction of the service; it was part of their hire. I may be allowed to say it was part of their blood and your independency; it is, therefore, more than a common debt; it can never be considered as a pension or gratuity, nor canceled until it is fairly discharged.

"Rewards in proportion to the aid the public draws from them are unquestionably due to all its servants. In some lines the soldiers have perhaps generally had as ample compensation for their service by the large bounties which have been paid to them as their officers will receive in the proposed commutation; in others, if besides the donations of land, the payment of arrearages of clothing and wages

*This letter is merely inserted as a historical document, to show that the nation has been confronted in the past with the problem of compensation for military services.

(in which articles all the component parts of the army must be put upon the same footing), we take into the estimate the bounties many of the soldiers have received, and the gratuity of one year's full pay, which is promised to all, possibly their situation (every circumstance being duly considered) will not be deemed less eligible than that of the officers.

"Should a further award, however, be judged equitable, I will venture to assert that no man will enjoy greater satisfaction than myself in an exemption from taxes for a limited time (which has been petitioned for in some instances), or any other adequate immunity or compensation granted to the brave defenders of their country's cause."

In 1779, Congress, at Washington's request allowed \$100 to each soldier who had enlisted early in the war to equalize his compensation with that of the men who received the later larger bounty for enlistment, August 2, 1785.

Abraham Lincoln applied for and accepted compensation for his services as captain of mounted volunteers in the Black Hawk War in the form of a special land grant which was given to soldiers of that service.

On July 22, 1861, Lincoln called for a half a million volunteers with the proviso that at the expiration of his enlistment each volunteer who had served for two years should receive \$100 in addition to travel pay. In 1862, Congress passed a law to raise 100,000 infantry men and offered each recruit one month's pay and a bounty of \$25 upon being mustered in.

At one time during the war, the Federal Government facing stubborn opposition to the draft offered as high as \$1,000 bounty for a single soldier.

These facts indicate the way in which bonuses and compensations have been handled in the past. *However, it must be admitted that no precedent exists for the contemplated inclusive adjusted compensation of a whole army—a proposal not of equalization of different standards of pay within the army itself but of equalization with civilian pay during the same period, unless soldier pensions were to be interpreted as a bonus or compensation.*

The merits of the Fordney-McCumber Bill is not the issue of this debate. The specific provisions of that bill are purposely omitted from this discussion. That bill is a dead issue, having

been disposed of in its present form. But the question survives. When adjusted compensation next appears in Congress it will be dressed in new clothes. At least, several important changes will, no doubt, be made. However, the aim of all legislation on this question has attempted to follow out the American Legion's optional plan. This is as it should be. For the measure comes in response to a claim and should serve the claimants in accordance with their needs and desires, if at all. It is reasonable to expect that whatever future legislation may be introduced that the American Legion plan will be followed as closely as possible. *This may not be the best plan, but it has met the approval of the men who would benefit from it. Therefore, it is the logical ground of contention for this debate.

THE ISSUES

1. Does the Federal Government owe an adjustment of compensation to its defenders in the World War; or is the claim of adjusted compensation right and just?
2. Is the Federal Government at the present time able to pay the claim for adjustment of compensation?
3. Should the Federal Government provide such adjustment on the optional plan proposed by the American Legion; or is the plan proposed sound economically and will it work out to the advantage of the soldier and the common good?

SUGGESTED BRIEF—AFFIRMATIVE

Resolved, That adjusted compensation embodying the four-fold optional plan of the American Legion should be granted to our soldiers of the World War by Congress now in session, because

- A. It is a moral obligation resting squarely upon the Federal Government, for
 - I. The Nation's defenders have suffered an economic injustice because of their service, for
 1. Their army pay was less than the civil pay of those who remained at home, for

*It should be borne in mind in this connection that the American Legion in its present active membership, represents but 25 per cent of our war forces.

- (a.) The private received \$30 a month, about 50 cents a day, board, and less than \$100 worth of clothes.
- (b.) The civilian received approximately 300% of his pre-war wage or about \$9 a day on the average.
- 2. They lost in potential earning power because of service which disqualified them for civil pursuits, for
 - (a.) Military discipline requires submission to autocratic authority without question and with full trust, for
 - (1) A soldier must take orders and obey them.
 - (2) He decides little or nothing for himself.
 - (3) He depends upon his superiors to provide for his safety and welfare.
 - (b.) Such an attitude is prohibitive of achievement and success in civil life, for
 - (1) An individual must not only be able to receive instructions but to give them.
 - (2) The measure of his success depends upon original, creative effort.
 - (3) He must provide for his own living, safety and general welfare.
 - (c.) Knowledge of warfare cannot be turned to the industry of peace, for
 - (1) They are directly opposite in character—
 - (a) One destroys, the other builds.
 - (2) The jobs of peaceful industry require specific knowledge and experience.
 - (d.) Many of the old jobs were filled and they were compelled to find a new place to fit into our economic system.
 - (e.) They lacked the potential power of the accumulated savings of those who had remained in civil life.
- 3. They suffered real hardships and were denied many of the comforts and conveniences which other Americans enjoyed as the fruits of the War, for

- (1) They returned to civil life "broke" or in debt.
 - (2) Because of business depression, they had difficulty in obtaining employment.
 - (3) They found no relief because of the indifference, the negligence or the mistrust of the people.
- II. The Federal Government has a sacred duty to rehabilitate the soldier in civilian life, because
1. He was selected by the Nation from the ranks of civilian life to defend his country and perform an unselfish service for the nation.
 - (a.) He was drafted by the selective service plan.
 2. The Federal Government recognizes its obligation to the disabled who came out of the War unequal to the demands of civilian life.
 - (a.) Through the Veterans' Bureau, the Government is compensating them.
 3. Many of the States have come to the aid of the veterans in granting them bonus or compensation, because
 - (a.) The Federal Government was slow to assume a recognized obligation.
 - (b.) The pressing need of the veteran made it seem right and just.
 - (c.) The future economic good of the Commonwealth made it a public concern.
 4. The Federal Government has given extra compensation in previous wars, for
 - (a.) In the Revolution, Congress voted \$100 to each soldier who had enlisted early in the war to equalize his compensation with that of the soldier who received the later bounties.
 - (b.) During the Civil War, bounties as high as \$1,000 were paid upon enlistment.
 - (c.) Veterans of the Mexican War were given extra compensation in land grants with an option on

cash settlement in treasury script bearing interest at 6%.

5. The United States Government has the example of her allies of the War as a further precedent,
 - (a.) Canada pays\$634.40 per soldier.
 - (b.) Belgium pays 492.00 per soldier.
 - (c.) France pays 233.53 per soldier.
 - (d.) England pays 189.54 per soldier.
 - (e.) Italy pays 73.34 per soldier.
 - (f.) In spite of the terrible losses to these countries and their burden of debt these obligations have been met with money borrowed from us.
6. The Federal Government has provided for the compensation of all others who suffered economic injustice from the War, because
 - (a.) Congress voted \$70,000,000 to the railroads for damage and depreciation of stock during Government control.
 - (b.) Congress voted \$3,000,000,000 to war contractors for cancelled war contracts and other losses incident to the war.
 - (c.) Congress has paid \$225,000,000 to Federal employers and \$100,000,000 to the Army and Navy as adjustment of compensation or extra pay.
7. The ex-soldier must contribute his part toward the payment of the costs of that War, for
 - (a.) He is pledged as a citizen to meet that obligation.
 - (b.) The taxes will come out of his pockets as well as those of the civilian who stayed behind.
- B. The Federal Government is able financially to pay an adjustment of compensation on an optional plan, because
 - I. The War, should it have continued a year longer, would have required more than the whole amount needed, a sum which the Nation was prepared to meet.
 - II. The Treasury has paid without concern to its stability enormous sums as compensation to railroads, Federal employees and contractors, for

1. No protest arose from Congress or the Secretary of Treasury to the payment of these sums.
- III. Financial conditions are vastly improved over those of a year ago; because
 1. Business is booming and production has returned to normalcy, for
 - (a.) Stocks and bonds have increased billions in value.
 - (b.) Liberty bonds are at par.
 2. The public treasury shows an improved condition, for
 - (a.) Interest on Government obligations has dropped from $5\frac{1}{2}\%$ to $3\frac{1}{2}\%$.
 - (b.) Treasury offerings during the year have been over-subscribed \$5,750,000,000.
 - (c.) The public debt has been decreased \$1,000,000,000 during the year and \$3,500,000,000 within the last three years.
 - (d.) The United States Treasury has practically all the gold in the world in its vaults and has become a great creditor nation, for
 - (1) The Allies owe us nearly \$10,000,000,000 for war loans.
during the year and \$3,500,000,000 within the last Secretary Mellon, the fiscal year ended June 30, showed a surplus of \$313,000,000.
 3. There is a great surplus of cash in the country seeking investment, for
 - (a.) More than \$4,000,000,000 worth of private securities and foreign loans were greedily taken up by the American public.
 - (b.) \$3,000,000,000 of bonds have been bought upon the New York exchange alone.
 - (c.) \$25,000,000,000 lies idle in the vaults of Federal Reserve banks and \$40,000,000,000 awaits the opportunity for investment in the banks of the country.

- (d.) Money is a drag on the market; for
 - (1) Financial magazines state that the difficulty now is to find investments for available money.
- 4. Under the optional plan, the immediate demand upon the Treasury will be small in comparison with the total sum involved; for
 - (a.) The greater part of the applications will ask for vocational training or for farm or home aid; for
 - (1) The veterans have formed a club among their number, pledging themselves to take their compensation in some other form than cash.
 - (b.) The adjusted service certificate will postpone by far the largest part of the cash payment for twenty years.
- C. The optional plan proposed by the American Legion is economically sound and provides for payment in ways which will best serve the veteran in his particular needs and desires; for
 - I. Adjusted compensation will affect approximately 3,750,000 men and women representing every section of the country and every station in life and a variety of needs and desires; for
 - 1. Some are in urgent need of cash or its equivalent in something which can be converted into cash.
 - 2. Many desire land as a means of economic security.
 - 3. Many wish to purchase or improve homes or farms, or pay off existing indebtedness.
 - 4. Many feel the need of vocational training in order to fit themselves for economic independence and to satisfy a legitimate ambition.
 - II. The optional plan will give the veteran the opportunity to apply his compensation in the way that will be most advantageous to him; for
 - 1. He may receive cash or its equivalent.
 - 2. He may buy a home, improve it or pay off the mortgage.

3. He may buy a farm or get a piece of land for settlement.
4. He may obtain vocational education and prepare himself for the needs of modern industry.
- III. The optional plan will be an economic boon to the country; for
 1. It will develop the resources of the country.
 - (a.) It will reclaim and develop waste land.
 - (b.) It will stabilize the soldier in civilian life by making it possible for him to own his own home.
 - (c.) It will return many soldiers to the farms where they are needed for agricultural production; for
 - (1) 57% of our population is in cities.
 - (d.) It will give him greater producing power and greater earning power which will contribute to his own welfare and the general prosperity of the country by training him in a vocation; for
 - (1) Many of the soldiers are untrained for industrial work.
 - (2) Modern industry requires skilled labor.
 - (e.) It will increase the amount of money in general circulation.

SUGGESTED BRIEF—NEGATIVE

Resolved, That adjusted compensation should not be granted to soldiers of the World War, because

- A. It is not an essential obligation of the Federal Government; for
 - I. Defense of country is the first duty of citizenship; for
 1. It is a service required without the promised reward of compensation in cash or other material form.
 2. It is a service required of young men, physically fit and capable of bearing arms; for
 - (a.) It has always been their privilege and part in time of war.
 - II. The reward to our gallant defenders for that service is found in the gratitude of the Nation and cannot be determined by a balance sheet; for

1. It is impossible to measure the real worth of that service; for
 - (a.) Manifestly, it is far greater than any other sacrifice of those who remain behind at home.
 - (b.) If it were possible to compute its value in material dollars it would be a stupendous sum, far greater than the inflated wage of a civilian in war times and far exceeding the ability of the Government to pay.
 2. It would put a price on an unselfish service and would result in commercializing patriotism; for
 - (a.) It would be like doing a good turn and then putting a price on it.
 - (b.) It would be like accepting a bribe for doing your duty.
 - (c.) It would be like auctioning off your soul to the highest bidder.
 - (d.) It would result in moral degeneracy of those ties which bind people together by love and devotion to a nation; for
 - (1) In the next war, men would be asking their Government, "What am I going to get out of it?"
- III. Many of the soldiers of the World War do not want and will not accept further compensation; for
1. It is like adding insult to injury; for
 - (a.) The people first forgot the soldier in the days of peace; for
 - (1) They did not receive him back into civilian life with friendliness and appreciation of his service and worth.
 - (2) They now offer him out of charity a pitiful reward in a material sum.
 2. The true soldier cannot accept a coin as the valuation of his services in defending his country; for

- (a.) It would be like performing a heroic act and then accepting the charity of his benefactor as a substitute for real gratitude.
 - (b.) All he wants is a chance to resume his place in the normal life of the country.
- IV. The fact that individuals and corporations were permitted to graft at the expense of the Government during the War or that rightfully or wrongfully compensations were granted to those who had legal claims upon the Government cannot be accepted as a legitimate reason for acceding to the soldier's claim; for
- 1. Two wrongs cannot make a right.
 - 2. It is the theory of Republican Government that the Treasury ought to be able to defend itself against any group who because of numbers or political influence attempt to raid the Treasury for their own benefit.
- V. The Government is bound by no precedent for such a disbursement of public funds; for
- 1. In former wars, no definite policy was ever formulated in the attempt to equalize in an economic way that difference which always exists between the civilian and the fighting man; for
 - (a.) In the Revolution the soldier's difficulty was in getting any pay at all while General Washington paid personal expenses amounting to over \$60,000 for which he was later compensated.
 - (b.) During the Civil War bounties or bonuses were paid, but not as adjustment of compensation.
 - (c.) The soldiers of the Mexican War were compensated in land, largely because the war resulted in territorial conquest and land was plentiful; for
 - (1) This was in the days when the Federal Government gave away land with a lavish hand.
 - (2) If this is precedent, it is bad precedent.
 - (d.) The Spanish American War veterans received no extra compensation which could be considered adequate as an adjustment.

- (e.) Civil and Spanish War veterans object to adjusted compensation for World War veterans because they did not receive extra pay for their service.
2. The aged veterans of all of these wars have been granted pensions by the Federal Government; because
- (a.) The Government has always recognized and performed its obligation to care for those in their old age who in their youth defended the colors.
- B. Payment even under the proposed plan is of such magnitude that it will complicate the strained condition of our finances and endanger the financial stability of the Nation; for
- I. The Treasury estimates for the pitifully inadequate Fordney-McCumber Bill, figure the direct cost at approximately
- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| For 1923 | \$145,000,000 |
| For 1924 | 225,000,000 |
| For 1925 | 114,000,000 |
| For 1926 | 312,000,000 |
| Total | \$795,000,000 |
- for the first four years and a total cost of more than \$4,000,000,000.
- II. Furthermore, there is the large indirect cost of administration which at least would be equal to the cost of administration of War Risk Insurance; for
1. Approximately three million soldiers are affected.
 2. An equal amount of routine will be required.
- III. The loans on the proposed adjusted certificates which estimates figure will amount to \$600,000,000 in the first three year period, will be floated on the credit of the Nation; for
1. If the veteran fails to redeem his certificate which the bank holds for security of the loan, the Secretary of Treasury is pledged to do so.
- IV. The present demands upon the Government are taxing the Treasury to the limit; for
1. The national debt is approximately \$23,000,000,000, interest on which totals more than \$1,000,000,000 per year.

2. Maturing obligations for the coming year amount approximately to \$4,000,000,000.
 3. In the next three years \$7,000,000,000 of debt will have to be refunded.
 4. The latest budget figures for the current fiscal year show a deficit of more than \$659,000,000.
 5. The tariff was enacted to increase revenue.
- V. At the same time, the revenues from taxes have decreased; because
1. Financial depression has reduced the income tax returns by millions.
 2. Maturing obligations for the coming year amount approximately to \$4,000,000,000.
 3. Even the interest on the Allied War debt has not been paid and many have urged the complete cancellation of those debts.
 4. The excess profits tax has been reduced saving the industries of the country \$450,000,000 annually which amount is lost by the Federal Government in its income.
 5. The adjustment of rates on large incomes saves the possessors of large fortunes \$90,000,000 annually, a sum of which the Federal Government is deprived.
- VI. Any adjustment, if made at all, should be paid by those who profited or profiteered most by the War, and not from the public Treasury; for
1. Their wealth came directly as a result of war conditions; for
 - (a.) One millionaire for every three soldiers was made during the War.—\$40,000,000,000 net profits.
- C. The proposed optional plan of the American Legion, as worked out in the Fordney-McCumber Bill, is economically inadequate and unsound.
- I. The cash feature will prove of no permanent benefit to the soldier; for
 1. The money will be squandered; for
 - (a.) There will not be enough to put to a business use.

- II. The adjusted certificate gives no immediate relief in a tangible way; for
1. It is an endowment payable at the expiration of twenty years.
 2. Its loan features are impractical; for
 - (a.) The banks may honor or refuse loans as they see fit; for
 - (1) They are merely authorized to accept certificates as security for loans.
 - (b.) The banks will not honor loans because the paper will lie dead on their hands from one to three years; for
 - (1) If the veteran fails to cancel his note, the bank cannot redeem the sum of the loan from the Treasury until after December, 1925.
 - (2) While the paper is negotiable, it would not be sold except at a big discount; for
 - (a.) No bank wants dead paper.
 3. Its loan features are unjust; for
 - (a.) It works a hardship on the veterans.
 - (1) The responsibility for securing the loan rests on the veteran; for
 - (a.) A bank will loan to him his moral worth and credit.
 - (b.) It is unfair to small country banks, for
 - (1) They hardly dare refuse such loans while city banks may do so with impunity.
 4. Its loan features are financially unsound; for
 - (a.) The veteran is drawing on the credit of the Nation for only 50% of its value; for
 - (1) He may borrow 50% not of the face value but of his adjusted service credit plus interest on his certificate.
 - (b.) Stocks of any industrial company listed on the stock exchange will be accepted for 75% of the face value.
 5. The amount possible to be obtained as a loan would be so small as to be of little or no use.

- III. As a constructive, economic measure it is inadequate; because
1. The average amount obtainable for farm or home aid would not be large enough to make the first payment required; for
 - (a.) It would amount to about \$300.
 2. The average amount obtainable for vocational training would not be sufficient to complete a course.
- IV. The land settlement feature was not found feasible and was omitted from the Fordney-McCumber Bill; for
1. It would involve a tremendous expenditure on the part of the Federal Government.
 2. It would not be available for years.
 3. Service men could not be informed of the projects and colonized on the land.
- V. Such constructive measures should be carried out by the several states, as twenty-seven states have done for their soldiers, not as compensation but as an economic program.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT*

Adjusted compensation for soldiers of the World War is a moral obligation of the Nation to its defenders because they suffered economic injustice because of their service. It is not a principle of democratic government to penalize soldiers for their service to country but to reward them. While the call to arms is a stern summons, it does not leave the Government without obligation to its fighters. Our Government has recognized such an obligation in the past and is now engaged in binding up the physical wounds of the disabled veterans of the recent war. At the same time, the Government has questioned its obligation to bind up the economic wounds incurred by the soldier who was fortunate enough to return sound in life and limb.

It is true that our soldiers were the best paid and best cared for of any army in history. However, this is placing the citizen soldier on the same basis with the professional. It was not so

*These arguments are not intended to be conclusive but merely to suggest possible lines of proof.

very long ago that these professional soldiers were virtually slaves, paid nothing in wages, receiving their reward in pillaging and plundering. But when nearly 4,000,000 men are selected from the civil population and taken from occupations of peace to defend their countrymen, the situation is changed. The soldier is a citizen and the citizen is the soldier. The Government is not an autocratic power to be served blindly without question but it is a clearing house for equalizing the burdens of war and assigning each his task. A democratic nation at war requires the mobilization of the whole population, some to bear arms, others to provide the supplies.

After the war is won and the nation is made secure, the soldier returns to take his place in the normal life of the country. But he finds that while he has been away, others, his fellow countrymen, have taken advantage of the country's peril to make themselves secure in the economic life of the country and are now reaping the material profits of his sacrifice. He discovers moreover that they are unwilling to share the rewards made possible by his service, saying that he merely has done his duty, and will take his medicine if he is a man. He finds himself in a strange environment out of touch with things and unable to take the place he left, because the gap has been closed and he is a surplus quantity. Where under Heaven, is the justice of that?

Compensation is a means of equalization in all industry. It is a purely economic principle. While the absolute compensation due the soldier for his matchless service cannot be measured in Treasury certificates, his economic losses can be determined with reasonable accuracy. It is for these losses that the soldier should be compensated by his Government. They are losses directly incident to war service just as the losses sustained by war contractors were losses calling for compensation from the Government. The only difference is that the war contractor had a legal claim while the soldier has but a moral draft upon his employer. The common law of justice and equity demands that if the former is a legitimate claim, so is the latter.

To illustrate, if two men work for the same employer, doing the same kind of work, one contracted to receive a certain wage, the other having no agreement, the latter may recover for his service the same wage as the former, provided the wage in the contract is the going wage for that kind of work. Yet, in spite of this principle of common law and justice, Congress voted \$3,000,000,000 compensation to war contractors and not one cent to the soldier. Besides, the war contractors received a legitimate profit on completed contracts and in some cases plundered the Government by profiteering while the soldier received less than one-half of his peace time wage.

The soldiers' compensation should at least be equal to the compensation of those who remained at home on the basis of equality of service, equality of pay—a purely democratic principle. If as a matter of fact the one who stayed at home received more than the soldier, then there is an inequality that needs adjustment.

What actually happened in the soldiers' case is illustrated from the following story which is taken from Senator McCumber's speech before the Senate on August 23, 1922.

Two boys are serving the same autocratic employer. He directs one to take his rifle, face his enemies and fight his battles, continuing the old wage of \$3 per day. He keeps the other at home and increases his wage to \$9 per day. But as he lacks the cash to pay the extra \$6 per day and as the fight is expected to last about 400 days, he asks for a note from his employee for the \$2,400, which amount he promises to add to his pay, but provided that the name of the fighter is signed also for security. The fighter finally comes home to find that his citizen brother has drawn \$2,400 more in wages and that his own name is attached to a note to help pay it, although he did not receive a cent of it. Thus, it is estimated that the soldier lost not less than \$850 in actual cash during his term of service on the basis of the average pre-war wage of \$25 per week. If his army pay were to be contrasted with the war-time wage of the ship builders, for instance, the loss sustained would be at least three times greater. In addition, the soldier finds himself tied to a national

debt of over \$23,000,000,000 to help pay these civilian wages, war contractors, Federal employees, railroad damage and Russian charity.

The soldier returns to civilian life with a new suit of clothes bought with the \$60 bonus but with no money in his pocket, no job and, in many cases, dependents and a mortgage or other debt upon his hands. His problem is to get back into the economic life of the country so that he may provide for himself and dependents, pay his debts and get on his feet again as a civilian. His service has unfitted him for civilian life; he knows how to capture a machine gun but that doesn't help him to hold down a job. There is a need for adjustment to new demands.

The Government has a moral obligation to assist in that adjustment. The Nation took him from civilian life; it should return him to his place and establish him there. Aside from the claim of the veteran for adjusted compensation as back pay or a reward for his services, he has the further claim for assistance in rehabilitation. The Government is assuming its obligation to the physically disabled. Why not to all? Are not the physically sound facing just as serious an economic problem?

The business depression following close upon the heels of the soldier's homecoming made his inequality all the more apparent. Many were without employment and could get none. Many others who had jobs, since they were the last taken on, were the first turned off when the pinch came. They and their dependents actually suffered. More than 700,000 ex-service men were out of jobs at one time. Frank J. Burt of West Hoboken, New Jersey, wearing the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Croix de Guerre with three palms, the French Medaille Militaire, the Italian Croce di Guerra and the Montenegrin War Cross walked the streets for fifteen months, unable to get a job of any kind. His war honors availed him nothing when it came to competition in the industry of civil life. Finally, through the efforts of the American Legion Employment Committee, he found a place as general utility man in the office of the county clerk. F. W. Smith of Omaha, Nebraska, head of a family of three, grasped at the chance offered him through the Legion

Employment Service to sell his blood for transfusion at \$25 a pint. During these bitter months, practically all of the blood used for transfusion in a Cleveland hospital was supplied by unemployed veterans.

This is a period of reconstruction in which all conditions arising from the War need to be readjusted before we as a nation are prepared to live at peace in industrial prosperity and social contentment. The sooner the returned veteran can establish himself on a new peace footing the sooner he will become a contented, constructive citizen. But we have seen that the experience of the War disqualified him for such a place. He had a great spiritual regeneration as a result of his unselfish service and a desire to make his country worthy of his sacrifice, but he found no opportunity to take hold to establish himself and to exert his influence in our economic and political life. His was a struggle for daily bread—in many cases a grim, heartless, hopeless struggle where innocent women and children suffered from a nation's indifference and neglect.

It is estimated that less than 40% of ex-soldiers have married since the War, a fact largely due to the economic problem of providing a living. Think of more than 3,000,000 young men willing and eager to settle down as constructive citizens to pay their own debts and the obligations of the Nation they helped to defend! Think of the social unrest, the instability of their purpose when they found hopes thwarted, promises unfulfilled, ambitions unsatisfied! Do you wonder that crime is on the increase, industrial discontent is a threatening rumble throughout a land where such injustice is not righted?

If our Government has a function to promote the general welfare, then it certainly is the duty of the Nation to establish its own servants in economic independence.

The American Legion plan offers the means. Many of those who served the colors were mere boys, thousands of them without even a high school education. They had not yet established themselves economically, but were partially dependent upon their parents for their support. But during their service they grew up. War works such transformations. They re-

turned home, old in experience with a serious desire to do something for themselves, to amount to something in the world. But they had little or no education. They did not know a technical trade. They were disarmed to stand defenseless in an unknown world.

There were others also, older men who had always wanted a chance to learn a trade, but the insistent necessity of making a living made further education impossible. These men too were awakened by the experience of the War to a vision of bigger living and larger service. They too had acquired a hunger for better things, which only an education could open up to them.

The vocational training aid which is now given to disabled veterans would be extended to all who desired it under the optional plan of the American Legion. These men would have the opportunity of fitting themselves for economic independence, and greater production with resulting prosperity would result in the Nation.

That thousands of veterans would take advantage of such compensation is beyond question. Those who have any claim upon the Government for disability, no matter how slight that disability, are taking advantage of the vocational training offered. Our colleges and universities are being swamped with applications for admission while the educational resources of the country are being extended to the utmost to care for those in attendance. It is impossible to estimate the number of those who are prevented from carrying on their plans for education because of financial necessity. But the conclusion is irresistible that the soldiers of the late War would be eager to avail themselves of the opportunity to take a course in vocational training. And it is at once evident that the industrial life of the country as a whole will profit from the increased efficiency of these men in larger production and greater prosperity. Aside from the moral obligation involved, as a business proposition, it is good business recognized and carried out in the practice of many leaders in industry.

The optional plan also provides for farm and home aid and for land settlement—all constructive measures from which the Nation will benefit along with the soldiers. The surest way to rehabilitate the soldier is to give him an ownership interest in the country he has defended. These young men have a long cherished desire to own land. What is more natural than to want a part of that which your service has made secure? This desire of the veterans is seen in their eagerness to obtain the land offered for settlement through the Department of the Interior. It is said that more than 10,000 veterans' applications were returned because there was not sufficient land available for settlement. Furthermore, in states like Oregon, for example, where the State has passed a bonus with a loan privilege for farm or home, the soldiers have proved themselves eager to take advantage of the opportunity for purchasing a home or farm or for paying off existing indebtedness.

Place these men on the farms; give them a chance to own their own homes; help them perhaps to pay off a mortgage arising from the stringencies of war and you will not only be meeting an essential obligation to them but will reap the benefits of a contented citizenship contributing to the moral and economic stability of the Nation. This is not a charitable bonus; it is more significant than a mere adjustment of an economic inequality. It is an investment in men, in citizens—the greatest investment that a Government can make with the surest and most profitable returns.

It is argued that the soldiers who came from the farms are unwilling to return, that they have a desire to enter the business life of the cities. In the cases where this is true, vocational training will open the avenue of approach to economic independence and business success. But there is no doubt that the majority would return to the soil if they could see their way to owning a farm and working for themselves instead of being just "the hired man." Many others who have immigrated to the cities would be lured back to the farms at the same time. This is an economic readjustment urgently needed. 57% of our population resides in cities while it is the task of less than 25%

of the people to raise the food and clothing for themselves and the other three-fourths. Meanwhile, cities face problems of unemployment, vagrancy and low standards of living. The returned soldier without a means of livelihood has complicated these problems. Send him back to the farm where he can have a chance to work his own farm, recover his self-respect and become an economic asset to the country.

There is no doubt that he will go and be glad for the chance. John S. McClain, writing in the Review of Reviews, November, 1922, says that many soldiers who came from the farms want to go back and some others would like to have farms if they knew how to get them. "For notwithstanding all that we see and hear of the drift from country to city, there is a real hunger for land; men do love the soil and yearn for enough of it on which to make a home." He shows that in Minnesota more than 400 *disabled* soldiers have taken their rehabilitation in agricultural training and are being assisted in the purchase of farms. If more than 400 *disabled* in a single state have shown a desire to establish themselves on farms what might be expected from the larger number of *able-bodied* soldiers who came to the army from rural life?

Moreover, thousands of acres of arid, swamp or waste land extend in desert tracts throughout the West and South. This is land which has been proved to be fertile and productive to a high degree but today it lies a deserted waste because of lack of water or drainage. This optional plan proposes that the Government cooperate with the veterans to reclaim these vast tracts so that both may profit.

Various reclamation bills have been introduced into Congress from time to time. It is a constructive program for internal development which is an established policy of the Government. Why not hasten this program to the extent of opening up large projects in all states where this land is available and permitting the soldier to assist in its reclamation and finally to establish himself upon it?

The Finance Committee in the Senate while yielding to the pressure of opponents to Government expenditures at the pres-

ent time for reclamation projects, recommended a "land settlement plan which will give the veterans a preference on the opening of public or Indian lands to entry or the restoration to entry of public lands, and on all reclamation projects now in existence or hereafter established, whether such reclamation is made by irrigation, drainage or otherwise." In any event, the land available should be sufficient in quantity, desirable in quality and practicable for agricultural purposes. If such is the case, it is certain that many soldiers will take advantage of the opportunity offered and the country as a whole will benefit from the consequent development of its natural resources.

SUMMARY

It is a principle of our democratic government to depend upon a citizen army for defense in time of war. It is further the recognized obligation of the Government to compensate its soldiers for disability incurred during their service. The Nation also has the problem which amounts to a moral obligation of restoring and rehabilitating its defenders in civilian life. If there is an inequality, physical, mental, economic between the soldier and the civilian at the time he returns to normal life, it is not only the duty but the vital interest of the Nation to make compensation or adjustment which will restore him to economic independence wherever possible. It is impossible to compensate for the loss of eyes or arms or legs in paltry dollars, but it is possible to right a degree of that inequality by giving him the means whereby he can make an honorable living without the reproach of charity. The same is true of the soldier who came through the War sound in life and limb. If he is suffering an inequality which makes it difficult for him to rehabilitate himself in civil life, then he must look to the Government for compensation to put him on his feet as an independent, constructive citizen. While it is impossible to measure the worth of his estimable service, it is possible and right that he should not suffer from that service if the Nation has the means to prevent it. He should not be penalized for his patriotism, to become an unselfish goat for a selfish world.

Such an inequality does exist. The soldier's pay during the War was not only less than the average civilian pay before the War but the man who stayed at home drew a war-time wage of more than three times his former wage. With his savings, he bought Liberty bonds, automobiles, homes, farms, stocks and bonds. The soldier returned and found his fellow citizen fairly well off in the world's goods, with a good job—the soldier's job very often—and good prospects for the future. The soldier had little or no savings, in many cases his only saving was a debt left over from pre-war days or incurred during his service. He had no job—not even the promised old place he had left in many cases; he was unfitted in mental attitude to take hold of civil life and meet its necessities. He could not take up the thread where he had laid it down so that he found himself two years behind his fellow citizen for every year of absence in the country's service. As a result he is suffering economically because of his service, a condition intolerable to any American with a sense of right and justice.

The optional plan for compensating him is sound economically because (1) it meets the individual's particular needs just as the Government attempts to deal with each disabled soldier according to his specific needs, (2) it discourages the payment in cash except where the sum is too small to be applied effectively in any other way or where cash best meets the needs of the veterans, (3) it offers vocational training, farm and home aid and special inducements for land settlement which gives the veteran the opportunity to go into partnership with the Government, to be "grub staked" now so that he may pay back in full from the natural resources he uncovers or transforms to wealth.

Some one must pay the bill. The veteran realizes that he must bear his share in that payment. He realizes, moreover, that he must bear his share of the war debt which has enriched his fellow citizens and left him merely with its burden. But he says to his Government, "you make up my inequality in compensation now so that I can get busy and I will show you how soon you will have it all back and enough more to pay your

debts." The position of the soldier under the optional plan is clearly brought out in the following illustration: A farmer owes his son for a part of his wages. Now, the son knows the farmer is hard pressed for *cash* so he says, "I will make you the following proposition: I want a farm of my own so I can make my own living. You give me a part of your farm, borrow money to pay me or let me use your credit to get one of my own and I will pay you out of my crops 10% on every penny I get from or through you. With that ten per cent you can pay back the money you borrowed, pay off your other debts and have a surplus left." Where is the father who would not recognize the good business sense of such a proposition? Would he not accept it immediately, especially if that son had worked to save the farm from the enemy who sought to possess it? This is the relation which exists between the soldier and his country under the proposed optional plan. It is not an attempt to raid the Treasury, as has been charged, but the sound proposition of America's sons who want economic adjustment on a basis which the Government can meet without hardship or injury. It is good common business sense, the kind of proposition you would expect from those who have shown the greatest love for country in the most unselfish service and who are intensely interested in the economic security and prosperity of the Nation.

The Government has followed out the custom of paying pensions to the aged, indigent or dependent of its "old soldiers." Commendable as this is, which is the more constructive policy, the assisting of the soldier to an independent place economically so that he may provide for his own old age or the withholding of that support at the time it is the most needed and later, when he has succumbed to failure, to step in and dispense charity to him? Which is more worthy of the gratitude of the Nation for the service rendered? Which is more conducive to the self-respect of our citizen soldiery and their place of honor before the Nation? Which challenges to individual effort and responsibility? Which is the more farseeing and just compensation for an unselfish service? The only possible answer is the adjustment of compensation at the time of

economic inequality and need, not when the soldier is no longer able to help himself. It is indisputable that the number of soldiers who would later draw soldiers' pensions would be materially reduced and at the same time those who would make their old age secure through their own industry would be able and willing to assist their less fortunate comrades in the payment of pensions. The poor and dependent will always be with us but this constructive economic measure will help to reduce the number to the minimum.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT

As the President pointed out in his veto message, "Though undying gratitude is the meed of everyone who served, it is not to be said that a material bestowal is an obligation to those who emerged from the great conflict not only unharmed, but physically, mentally and spiritually richer for the great experience."

The service of country in time of national danger is not merely a duty but a privilege of the citizen. He goes out to defend his own home and possessions and to protect his own loved ones. The man who went out to fight in the recent war did not expect more than a soldier's pay for his service. He gave unselfishly in sacrifice and service without thought of reward except a clear conscience, a fireside free from the oppressor and the chance to enjoy the fruits of his labor and the good will and gratitude of his friends and loved ones.

Besides, he did not come out of the War a bankrupt. The Government trained him physically and sent him back home a strong man and not a weakling. He was taught clerking and accounting, cooking and baking, mechanics and music, truck driving and road building, nursing and first-aid, radio and telegraphy, map making and calculation—each man a trade which could be turned to practical use in civil life. The men who were left to go "over the top" were those who were unable or unwilling to qualify for any of these special tasks or who preferred to serve in the first line.

Even these received something. As a matter of fact, many of them were not self-supporting in civil life and went into the army without education, without special knowledge of a trade, with a few cents in their pockets as their only possession in the world. They were taught to be self-reliant and self-supporting. They learned the necessity of living within their incomes, the habits of a regular, ordered life with a purpose. They learned the wisdom of providing for the future by being compelled to take out and keep up War Risk Insurance as a security against disability or death. They learned how to meet man to man with their fellows; they learned courage, determination and fortitude. They learned how to take care of themselves and to provide for their own welfare. They were taught the laws of health, cured of disease and made to practice hygiene and sanitation. They came out men, ready to look the world in the face and take their place without asking for a continuation of the bounty which they received from the Red Cross, the War Camp Community Service, and the people everywhere during the War itself.

Business conditions are improving, industrial turmoil and discontent are fast disappearing and the result is increased production, more jobs, less unemployment, greater earnings and savings. The service man who desires economic independence and is willing to accept the conditions by which it is achieved has long since found a place and adjusted himself to the demands of civil life. As for the other fellow who is unwilling to pay the price and continues to live in inflated, war-time extravagance and improvidence, how does he differ from the deplorable class to which he belongs? Had he remained in civil life, it is doubtful whether he would be found any farther along the road towards economic security. Why, then should his plight be taken as a conclusive proof of the Government's obligation to him and the men who have had manhood enough to get on their feet and who do not want nor look for financial assistance from the Federal Government?

Many of these have sent their protests in to Congress and the President because their sense of honor, right and justice

and their interest in the country's welfare will not permit them to ask selfishly for a special grant from the public Treasury—to exploit the Treasury at the country's expense merely because it lies within their power.

The attitude of another large group has been pointed out by David Lawrence, newspaper correspondent, in a story which appeared in the Lexington Leader, February 10, 1922. As a result of Government indifference and inexcusable delay and bungling in the functioning of the Government through the Veterans' Bureau to take care of disabled soldiers and their dependents, a feeling of neglect was created in the minds of many service men. This feeling grew and was nourished by the service man's champion, the American Legion. Those who had no way of showing their dissatisfaction before with governmental indifference now are demanding the bonus simply because Congress is wavering about granting it. As one service man wrote to the President, "I do not need a bonus but if it comes, I shall receive it as ungratefully as it is grudgingly given." Such an attitude is not less than a cold blooded desire to get hold of public funds which he realizes he does not need and to which he knows he has no legitimate right or claim.

The fact that the political promises of Congressmen have fed the flame of his dissatisfaction and resentment against neglect is not a sound argument for adujsted compensation but, on the contrary, is a shameful page in American political history.

From the President on down, the question has been a political pawn, literally a "gold brick." Representative John C. Box of Texas, speaking before the House, September 20, 1922, in response to the National Executive's veto message said concerning the affair, "Its whole design has been to pretend that legislation for the special benefit of all ex-service men was to be enacted, when those who controlled Congress and the Government knew—and all members of Congress should have known—that nothing but a hypocritical farce was being enacted for the purpose of inducing the ex-service men and their friends who favor the legislation to vote for them. The pretense at passing the bill itself is a farce."

Five Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, which reported the bonus bill, filed a minority report ridiculing the bill as dishonest. They say:

"Treat the boys white, gentlemen of Republican Congress. If you really favor the money bonus, pay them like men in cash in full and do not send them out of the Capital with any scraps of paper, tramping mendicants at the mercy of the banks in our towns and cities. . . . He now deserves fair, manly treatment at your hands. . . . What do you offer him—a gold brick?—Signed by Honorable Claude Kitchen, Honorable W. A. Oldfield, Honorable Charles R. Crisp, Honorable John F. Carew, Honorable Peter G. Tague, all Democratic members of the House Committee on Ways and Means. (Record, 2d sess., 67th Cong., p. 5198.)"

Honorable Walter M. Chandler, Republican, speaking about this bill on the floor of the House, told some of the many things members had said to him in private conversation about this bill without giving the names of persons making the statements. He said:

"Now, contrast for a moment, if you please, this language with the declarations in private conversation and in public debate of the Members of this House upon the pending measure:

"The bill is an insult to every World War Veteran, a shameful disgrace to Congress and the Nation, but I will vote for it.

"I do not believe that the measure is a good one but the soldier boys at home want it, and let them have it.

"I know that it is a bad measure, but I have made a pledge to support it, and I shall have to keep the pledge.

"Any man who votes against the bill will be defeated. I shall vote for it.

"It may be statesmanship to oppose this bill, but there is such a thing as a statesman without a job. Excuse me.

"The bill is damned bunk, but the Legion demands it."

"These are almost verbatim quotations of language that I have heard from members in hotel lobbies, in the house, and on the floor of this Chamber. And these are but specimens of scores of others that I have heard. (Record, 2d sess., 67th Cong., pp. 5249-5250.)"

He further states that just before the primaries of 1920 when the original bill was up before the House, "Members winked and smiled knowingly as they talked and voted for the bill." The bill was shelved by the Senate and sent back to the shelf again and again during the year that followed. Political expediency brought the bill to an undignified and hasty consideration at the eleventh hour of the 67th Congress because of approaching elections. Many who voted for it knew that the

President would veto it and took the pains to assure themselves of that fact. Well, the President did, in a manner flagrantly inconsistent with his former campaign promises and later acts. "The President and Members of Congress while candidates promised too much, promised more than the situation warranted, promised more than they had reason to believe could be granted. That is the source of this shameful predicament of the Government, in which the President first declared that he favored the bonus bill then pending, though it did not provide the money to pay it, then later says he favored one if the means of paying it were provided; and then, in his veto message argues against this one, chiefly because it does not provide funds for its payment; and then argues against the payment of any bonus; a predicament in which the majority of Congress put up a dummy—offer the men a gold brick, which many of the Members denounce as 'a sham,' 'a fraud,' 'a gold brick,' and then proceed to vote for it. . . . When asking the people to vote for them they had promised the taxpayer that Federal taxes and expenses would be reduced and at the same time promised ex-service men additional compensation. Both could not be granted."

Moreover, the Government made adequate provision for our soldiers. They were paid the highest soldier pay in history, enough to cover their actual needs. The average soldier had more spending money than had ever been his lot before and if he did not save anything, he lived according to a better standard than that to which he had been accustomed. He was given insurance at a ridiculously cheap rate, taken from his own pay for his own benefit or the benefit of those who were near and dear to him.

The men with families and dependents were specially provided for. They were permitted to make allotments of pay of \$15 a month to be matched with a like sum from the Government. In many cases the amount received was more than that and oftentimes it found its way back directly to the man who made it. For in our large cantonments the wives and families of married men were permitted to join the husband and father

and live with him in camp in special quarters provided and furnished by the Government. Furthermore, the married soldier was allowed \$15 per month for his meals in addition to his regular pay so that he was actually receiving his own clothes, \$30 a month in pay, \$15 a month allotment for his wife and more for his family, \$15 a month allowance for meals, furnished quarters provided and his groceries and supplies at wholesale cost. Consequently his standard of living on the average was equal if not superior to his pre-war status.

When the soldier returned to civil life he was given travel pay of 8 cents a mile to his place of enlistment, which in many cases was never used but turned into cash while the veteran beat his way home on trains or tramped the distance or settled near the place of discharge or found a position where he could get his traveling expenses paid. Furthermore, the Government paid him a \$60 bonus and all back pay due which in many cases amounted to more than \$100, so that the average soldier faced civilian life with his complete outfit of army clothes and more than a hundred dollars in his pocket.

At that time the Community Service was still functioning. It served as an employment bureau for the veterans. The people were kindly disposed toward the soldier and readily offered him employment where he was equal to the job. Those who remained in the ranks of the unemployed were largely those who had been drawn from that same condition—unemployed because they knew nothing and could do nothing. That class is always present and it was but natural that a large army drawn from all classes should include many of the floating unemployed, some criminals, some beggars caught up in the Nation's fish net for National Service. Consequently, the problem is not a special one confined to reconstruction after war, but it strikes deeper into the main springs of our social order.

During the business depression which followed short upon the close of the War, there is no doubt that many men returned from the War, suffered, but it is a question whether they suffered because of their service. Would they not have suffered anyway? It is a fact that ex-soldiers were not the only ones

who felt the pinch of business reverses. Many of the newly rich whose profits came from the War boom or from profiteering, went to the wall. The farmers suffered too—those men who had stood faithfully behind the Government and sold wheat at a fixed price without complaint. They lost their farms and felt the bottom of their money sacks but did they ask for compensation for their war losses because the Government fixed the price of wheat as that same Government fixed the wages of its fighting men? Other workers with dependent families faced the grim problem of unemployment too. What of them? They too sacrificed during the War in the purchase of liberty bonds, through the Red Cross and other relief organizations.

The misfortunes of the soldier have been pushed before the public because he wore the uniform and perhaps because he still wears an army overcoat. But the man beside him may have neither a job nor an overcoat. If conditions like these exist in the country, it is indeed lamentable, but let us not permit sentiment toward the soldier hero to blind us to the real cause of such a situation nor lead us to a measure of relief for but a single class while the rest of the population find no help from their condition. It is manifestly unfair to base a moral obligation of the Government towards its soldier citizens upon such grounds.

Furthermore, if the soldier's economic misfortunes are to be taken as an argument for adjusted compensation, the time has passed when such assistance is needed for the soldier. Through the Employment Service of the American Legion, the 700,000 who were reported jobless are now placed in positions in practically all cases where the man is willing to work and is dependable and capable.

The President, convinced that the soldier's claim was based upon fallacious argument and totally unwarranted and conscious of the insincerity of the action of many members of Congress upon the measure, heeded the expert financial advice of his Secretary of Treasury and refused his sanction to the bill

though it compromised him in the eyes of the soldiers who held his pledge—a fact which he acknowledged in his veto message.

In that message he points out in an able manner the perilous financial condition of the country which would be aggravated still more by the payment of a non-essential obligation. The sum estimated by the Secretary of Treasury as the direct cost of the measure under consideration would amount to over \$4,000,000,000—nearly one billion dollars in the first four years. Yet, with the expenditure of such an enormous sum which would tax the Treasury to the utmost and would eventually have to be paid in increased taxes, the individual soldier would receive the pitifully small sum of \$250 on the average. As compensation this is miserably inadequate; as a bonus, it is too small to be of much constructive use. Even under the option of farm or home aid, the amount increased by 25% would not be sufficient to make the first payment required. Moreover, the man who wishes to be paid in cash cannot do so if his credit amounts to more than \$50. Instead he gets an adjusted service certificate—a promise to pay with interest and emoluments, maturing in 20 years. Meanwhile, the only means for immediate relief which is available to him is offered in the certificate loan plan which authorizes banks to give him a loan of 50% of the full value of his compensation on the credit of the United States.

As the President points out, it is a perversion of public funds on the one hand and an abuse of national credit on the other. The expenditures of the Treasury must be defensible against class legislation. Otherwise our Government would be at the mercy of any group politically strong enough to vote themselves money from the public wealth of the whole people. Theodore Price, eminent economist and editor of *Commerce and Finance*, has declared that those who look for national prosperity as the result of a bonus in increased circulation of money and economic development are not looking far enough. If they were, they could see that to tax one class to give largess to another will never bring prosperity to the whole. It is nothing more than that modern game of “passing the buck” back and forth,

without considering who is going to have to pay at last. It recalls Stevenson's story of *The Bottle Imp*. (Read it and find the application.)

By far the greater number of soldiers will take their compensation in cash or in a Treasury certificate if that is the only alternative. Everybody wants cash. Human nature is so constituted that cash is preferable to all other means of settlement,—cash without a string tied to it. The individual insists upon his right to be free though he may be the loser by his insistence. Such is the inordinate demand in all our business relations.

In addition, the soldier realizes that the sum of his adjusted credit will be too small to apply effectively in the purchase of a house or farm so that even though he desires farm aid, he will apply for the cash option. In the Vocational Training School for Disabled Veterans at the University of Kentucky, the men who almost without exception come from the farmer class have declared their determination to apply for cash settlement.

The same will prove true of the vocational training option. The men who realize the value of such training and would be the ones presumably to avail themselves of that training are now established in industrial positions to their liking. It is unlikely that these men would give up a good job with the chance of advancement open to them to take a course in vocational training. They will instead apply for cash or certificate payment so that they may apply this money on courses in night school or some such thing as that.

Now, if the greater number will apply for cash, and that is beyond reasonable question, the Government faces the dilemma of increasing the burden of taxes to pay it or putting off the ultimate date of payment by issuing a certificate with a loan privilege. In either case, the result is undesirable. Congress was presented with this same predicament and sought to dodge the former by offering farm and home aid and vocational training in lieu of cash but our legislators could not escape the alternative of borrowing on the Nation's credit and offering the adjusted service certificate.

Now, what will happen to this certificate in the hands of the veteran? He will take it to a bank and realize its loan value in cash without any thought of redeeming his certificate and taking up his note. He will argue, "Well, I have this much cash in hand. If I pay it back, I will have to wait twenty years to win and I may be dead by that time. I will just keep what I have because it is inconvenient to pay it back anyway. The bank won't lose because it can get its money from the Federal Treasury." What is the result? The veteran lets the Treasury assume his certificate and at the end of the twenty years, if he is still living, he can redeem his certificate and still be ahead. Meanwhile, the cash which he obtained has been spent not in constructive investment but in the ordinary course of life. If you doubt that this will be the attitude of many soldiers, investigate the history of War Risk Insurance since the close of the War.

SUMMARY

The American Legion plan is a makeshift, and economically unsound. It proposes various options, unequal in value and barren of the benefits which are claimed for them. A premium is placed upon vocational training and home and farm aid, in the hope that the ex-service men will be attracted to these forms of payment, and thus relieve the immediate demand for cash. The proponents of the measure are relying upon the sentiment of the people towards the soldier in helping him to own his own home and to get an education to win their support for so-called adjusted compensation. Its advocates realize that if it were proposed to pay the bonus in cash, as the Government would make payment of any just debt, they could not hope to gain the consent of the people. It would be said at once that the money would be squandered, and would result in no good to the soldier. But if it were a matter of adjusted compensation, as it is claimed, such consideration would not enter into it for one moment. If it isn't right in cash, then it isn't right.

If the proposed plan were an honest attempt to assist the soldier to ownership of a home or to securing an education, aside from the question of adjusted compensation, much might be said for it. But let us not be deceived by this economic prospectus. The financial assistance offered the average soldier who wants to buy a home or farm is hopelessly inadequate. With it, he could not even make the first payment required. In addition, the land settlement feature was found impractical and discarded in the Senate discussion of the bill. It would involve an enormous expenditure of money for the development of projects and require time for their completion, so that it would be extremely doubtful whether many soldiers would be aided by such a scheme. As for vocational training, those who would be disposed to take advantage of this option are either in school or settled in a good job. In either case, by the time such an opportunity would be afforded to them, they would find themselves unable to take advantage of it. Therefore, in spite of the efforts of the sponsors of the plan to emphasize the farm and home aid and vocational training features, as a matter of fact, the majority will accept the cash option. If the service credit is less than \$50, they will receive a check in full—a sum insufficient for any real economic purpose.

If the service credit is more, the adjusted service certificate is the alternative. This certificate can be cashed in twenty years and, as an investment from the soldier's viewpoint, is a good one, but what means are offered for immediate relief, or what aid towards economic security? A 50% loan benefit is all that can be realized from it, a sum inadequate for an ordinary economic use. At the same time, the credit of the Nation is being used for one-half its value which, in itself, is a violation of all the laws of finance.

The proposed plan is a makeshift. It was drafted in an effort to meet the exigencies of our financial situation and to overcome the objections of those opposed to its principle. In substance, this plan makes the ex-service men say, "We want a bonus. If we can't get it in cash, we are willing to take it in any form that we can get it. But we want a bonus!" Such

an admission, which, in effect, the proposed plan suggests, favors the presumption that those who are making the claim realize that they have insufficient grounds for it and are content to accept what they can get. It is equivalent to saying, "If the Treasury is going to hand out appropriations to war contractors, railroads and civil employees, we are going to have a cut of the pie, too. If we can't have a whole piece, we'll get as big a piece as we can." This in its intent and purpose is not compensation but a misappropriation of public funds and is condemned by the President in his veto message.

He says, "If an obligation were to be admitted, it would be to charge the adjusted compensation bill with inadequacy and stinginess wholly unbecoming our Republic. Such a bestowal, to be worth while, must be generous and without apology." The President is opposed to giving the soldiers what has been termed a "gold brick" for their incomparable service to the Nation; he is opposed to giving them a stone when they ask for bread, that bread which will sustain a life of patriotism and love to country, the "undying gratitude" of 100,000,000 thankful hearts.

Moreover, such a plan, miserably inadequate and economically unsound as it is, can not be carried out at the present time without adding materially to the Nation's already heavy burden of debt and increasing the load of taxes each individual citizen must shoulder and carry.

A national debt of \$23,000,000,000 must be paid, \$4,000,000,000 in the coming year, \$7,000,000,000 in the next three years. The budget figures for the current fiscal year show a deficit of \$650,000,000. For, with many of the debts of the war yet to be paid, the sources of our war-time revenue have been drying up. With the repeal of the excess profits tax and the surtax on large incomes, the Government is facing the serious problem of living within its income. The administration has adopted the policy of retrenching and reducing the maintenance cost of Government to the minimum and reducing taxes as rapidly as possible to their normal level.

Those who believe that it is a simple and easy thing to saddle on to our Treasury the sum of \$4,000,000,000 should recall that the interest alone on our national debt amounts to \$1,000,000,000 annually, a sum which we can name but which it is impossible for us to imagine. The argument that a Government like ours that holds within its hands practically all the gold in the world and is now a great creditor Nation, can add a few billions to its national debt without feeling it, is fundamentally unsound. Granted we do have natural resources amounting to \$350,000,000,000 to which our national debt holds a ratio of less than 8% and the sum for adjusted compensation but 1%, granted that this is low in comparison with European countries, it does not follow that to add to our national debt and to increase the burden of taxes is a wise and desirable policy in our country.

There are certain economic principles to be considered. We depend upon taxes for revenue. The amount of taxes is determined by the cost of Government and the Nation's constructive program. Which is the wiser and more statesmanlike policy: to reduce the maintenance cost of Government by better organization and efficiency, fewer employees and departments and to curtail the expenditures to essential obligations, or to spend with a lavish hand because we are a rich nation and can afford to increase our national debt?

In the face of the difficulties which confront the Treasury in readjusting its payments to meet a reduced income, and in solving the pressing problems of reconstruction, it would be folly to complicate the problem by voting so-called adjusted compensation which neither compensates nor offers a sound economic investment.

Various means have been proposed for raising the money. But when all is said and done, the people must pay the bill. One class can not be taxed to aid another. The war loans are already pledged to the payment of Liberty Bonds. The proposed bill offers no means for meeting the cost but delays payment or "passes the buck" to a later time in the hope that somehow it can be paid. If any business firm should attempt to do business on such a basis, it would lose the confidence of all sane

business men and probably go into bankruptcy. Although no one seriously believes that our Government would become insolvent in voting so-called adjusted compensation, common sense must dictate that it is poor business.

Finally, the whole question resolves itself into one proposition. Granting that the Nation could pay the bonus without increasing taxes, which it can not, and granting that the American Legion's optional plan is economically sound, which it is not, the most significant fact remains and that is, that adjusted compensation or a "material bestowal" is not an essential obligation of the Government "to those who emerged from the great conflict, not only unharmed, but physically, mentally and spiritually richer for the great experience."

The disabled are being treated by the Government with a generosity that is unequalled in our history or among the nations of Europe. All claims for disability, no matter how slight, have been recognized and bounteously met. The recipients are well satisfied. Many of them realize that they have been more than repaid for injury or disability. As a matter of fact, many of them have not been handicapped to any serious degree by their disability and are physically in good health and able to provide for themselves. They testify to the generosity of the Government in their behalf.

But, for the able-bodied soldier, no such obligation is recognized; nor does it exist. The soldier who went to the war accepted his task as a patriotic duty and sacrifice. He did not expect more than a soldier's pay. He realizes that he was as well cared for as the exigencies of war would permit. He knows that he did not come home a bankrupt. He knows that he is either a man or a "rotter." He knows that if he is a man, he can take care of himself. He knows that he has found his place in our economic life and can now maintain himself without further assistance. He appreciates the sentiment of the people toward him but he does not want gratitude in a "material bestowal." He knows the people are debtor to him but that they can not discharge their debt in cash, but only in unceasing gratitude, which is his right.

THE BONUS QUESTION BY DAVID LAWRENCE

The following copyrighted article on the Bonus, written by David Lawrence, Washington correspondent of the New York Evening Post, appeared in the Lexington Leader, November 19, 1922. (Reproduced by permission of the Lexington Leader.)

Prohibition and soldier bonus were of sufficient importance in the last elections as to be considered today by political Washington as the leading domestic issues before the country.

President Harding has hinted that there is a shifting of views on prohibition and there are rumors that he himself will do some shifting on the bonus.

Authorized spokesmen for the President say he will veto any bill passed by Congress similar to the one put up to him earlier this year. But before that time comes something concrete in the way of a bonus proposal may be expected from the executive. Whether mention will be made of the subject in the message to be read to Congress at the regular session in December is not yet determined, but, there are many among the President's friends who advise him to take the initiative in the matter of adjusted compensation for the soldiers and propose something that his party can unite on.

The latest suggestion which has found support in administration quarters, tho it cannot be said that Mr. Harding will be won over to it, is one that looks to the federal government and the States to enter into a combination of a sort of fifty-fifty proposition just as has been the case with good roads—the federal government appropriates on condition that an equal sum is raised by a State and the quotas are divided according to the needs of the States.

STATES FOR BONUS

Twenty-seven out of the forty-eight States of the Union are willing to give bonuses. Last week, Illinois, Iowa, Oklahoma, Kansas, Montana and California voted soldier bonuses. Seventeen States acted earlier, namely, Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington and Wisconsin. In addition Colorado voted \$200 each to ex-service men for vocational training. New York went on record in favor of a \$45,000,000 fund but it got tangled in constitutional difficulties. Pennsylvania's legislature in 1921 authorized submission of a constitutional amendment involving \$35,000,000, but this is expected to be submitted again by the new legislature.

Twenty-seven out of forty-eight represents a majority but it doesn't reflect the true effect of the bonus sentiment, because many States have been waiting on the federal government and the bonus movement hasn't received the impetus it would otherwise receive if the States were to know they were required to cooperate with the federal government.

FAVORS BONUS IN PRINCIPLE.

President Harding is in favor of the bonus in principle. His whole argument has been that the federal government couldn't afford

to add to its national debt. He hasn't contended that the United States wasn't wealthy enough to pay a bonus but he has plainly feared the effects of piling the public debt higher. To impose the burden on the States or to share the debt with the States would not be the same as the original proposals and there is a chance that some plan of this kind would win executive favor.

Six States—Delaware, Maryland, Indiana, Tennessee, Texas and Utah—have considered the bonus without favorable action, but if the federal government submitted a proposition of cooperation there is reason to believe the question would receive different treatment. The argument is made by proponents of the plan that the States are better able to finance the bonus than is the federal government. Certainly some of the States have not yet been made to realize the necessity for economy in the balancing of their budgets and the grant of a bonus may have the effect of making many States take better account of their fiscal conditions. Also, the income taxes of the States are not efficiently gathered in all cases. The appropriation of a bonus would have a far-reaching effect on State taxation.

There will no doubt be an attempt made to make the States shoulder the entire burden, but the American Legion would fight that tooth and nail as it means a long drawn out process without certainty of favorable action in the end. One cannot be sure how the legion would view even a combined federal government and State proposal, but if President Harding got back of the plan and the federal government passed legislation promising to do its part the legion would probably feel that half a loaf was better than none and would assist in the campaign in the States.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the bibliography listed on the following pages a large list of material is given. In order to single out a few important documents on the Soldiers' Bonus, the following list of publications is recommended as being important in the discussion of the question. Where schools expect to procure only a limited amount of material, the following publications should be procured:

Soldiers' Compensation. The bill as passed by the House and Senate, including the President's Veto message. Published as House Document No. 396. Also printed in the Congressional Record, Vol. 62, No. 237, September 20, 1922. Price 11 cents.

Speech by Honorable Porter J. McCumber of North Dakota in the Senate, favoring the bill, on August 23, 1922. Published in pamphlet form.

Speech by Mr. Jeffers of Alabama, on September 20, 1922. Published in Congressional Record, September 20, 1922, Volume 62, No. 237, page 14,025, favoring the bill. Price 11 cents. (Same number as veto message).

Editorial in American Legion Weekly, Vol. 4, No. 41, October 6, 1922, entitled "Payment in Platitudes," answering the President's

veto. American Legion Weekly, New York City. Copies may possibly be had from local posts of the American Legion, from libraries, or, if not exhausted, procured from the American Legion Weekly at the address given.

Valuable articles and editorials opposing the bill may be found in the Wall Street Journal, New York City. If not found in libraries, write to the Wall Street Journal and purchase such copies as are desired.

Valuable articles and pamphlets in favor of adjusted compensation may be obtained free from the American Legion, American Legion Headquarters, Indianapolis, Indiana. These articles are in the nature of discussions and pamphlets prepared for speakers. Articles are in favor of the measure.

Where schools do not desire to purchase all of the material listed in this bibliography, it is possible to make a selection of material on both sides and purchase the pamphlets for a few cents from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Place your order now. (Send silver; stamps are not accepted).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following printed matter may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at the price indicated. Send silver or money order (stamps are not accepted by the Government Printing Office.) *Much of the material can, no doubt, be had free by writing to your congressman, and stating what material is desired.* The following documents have been published in pamphlet form:

Resolution adopted by Charles A. Learned Post, No. 1, the American Legion, in regard to compensation for ex-service men. (In Congressional Record of January 23, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 35, p. 2084). Price 9 cents.

Speech of Honorable Ernest R. Ackerman, of New Jersey. Extension of remarks in House, opposing bill. (In Congressional Record of May 11, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 131, pp. 7467-8). Price 11 cents.

Speech by Honorable John M. Baer of North Dakota. Extension of remarks in House, favoring bill for adjusted compensation for service men. (In Congressional Record of May 31, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 149, pp. 8661-3). Price 11 cents.

Speech by Honorable Henry I. Emerson of Ohio, in House, February 20, 1920, recommending payment of additional bonus to soldiers, giving tables showing war gratuities for military men of various countries. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 60, pp. 3408-10). Price 7 cents.

Speech by Honorable John M. Evans of Montana. Extension of remarks in House recommending a tax on individual incomes in order to provide funds for the soldiers' bonus. (In Congressional Record of May 18, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 138, pp. 1859-61). Price 12 cents.

Speech by Honorable James A. Frear of Wisconsin, in House, April 27, 1920, favoring bonus for the soldiers. (In Congressional Record of April 28, Vol. 59, No. 120, pp. 6760-7). Price 9 cents.

Speech by Honorable Anthony J. Griffin of New York. Extension of remarks in House, on the bonus question, recommending in lieu of bonus, the return of the war risk premiums and allotments. (In Congressional Record of March 31, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 95, pp. 5472-3). Price 7 cents.

Speech by Honorable Andricus A. Jones of New Mexico, in Senate, March 3, 1921, on bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 60, No. 78, pp. 4604-9). Price 20 cents.

Speech by Honorable William E. Mason of Illinois. Extension of remarks in House, favoring bill. (In Congressional Record of April 21, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 114, pp. 6459-60). Price 7 cents.

Speech of Honorable R. Walton Moore of Virginia, in House, May 5, 1920, opposing bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 126, pp. 7106-7). Price 5 cents.

Speech by Honorable Henry L. Myers of Montana, in Senate, May 29, 1920, opposing bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 148, pp. 8485-6). Price 12 cents.

Speech by Honorable James O'Connor of Louisiana. Extension of remarks in House in favor of bill. (In Congressional Record of May 10, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 130, pp. 7384-6). Price 8 cents.

Speech by Honorable Henry Z. Osborne of California, in House, February, 1920, recommending payment to soldiers of additional bonus in the form of a bond. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 55, pp. 3089-90). Price 5 cents.

Speech by Honorable Henry T. Rainey of Illinois, in House, April 22, 1920, favoring the bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 115, pp. 6486-93). Price 6 cents.

Speech by Honorable Isaac R. Sherwood of Ohio, in House, February 20, 1920, recommending additional bonus to soldiers, reduction of size of Regular Army, and opposing universal military training. (In Congressional Record of February 24, 1920, Vol. 59, No. 63, pp. 3624-6). Price 8 cents.

Speeches by Representative Griffin, April 27, Representative Johnson of South Dakota, May 1, and Representative Ferris, April 29, on soldiers' bonus. (In Congressional Record of May 3, Vol. 59, No. 124, pp. 7002-16). Price 8 cents.

Speeches in House, April 27, 1920, by Representative Clark of Missouri and Rainey in favor of taxation of corporations and war profits, in order to raise funds for bonus. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 119, pp. 6692-7). Price 6 cents.

Speeches in House, May 6, 1920, by Representatives Treadway, McKeown, Childblow, Mann of Illinois, Tillman, Hastings, and others on bonus bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 127, pp. 7141-3, 7157-9). Price 8 cents.

Speech in House, May 29, 1920, by Representative Evans, and extension of remarks by Representative Yates, opposing bill. (In Congressional Record of June 5, Vol. 59, No. 154, pp. 9341-2, 9369). Price 16 cents.

Speeches in Senate, June 2, 1920, by Senator Dial (opposing), and in House by Representatives Kearns and Warren (favoring) and Representative Burroughs (opposing) bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 151, pp. 8821-5, 8860-9). Price 20 cents.

Speeches in House, June 4, 1920, by Representatives Thomas and Robison of Kentucky, favoring bill. (In Congressional Record of June 14, Vol. 59, No. 155, pp. 9407-9, 9423). Price 12 cents.

Speeches in Senate, February 28, 1921, by Senators McCumber and Jones of New Mexico, favoring bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 60, No. 75, pp. 4279-80, 4286-91). Price 10 cents.

Speech by Honorable James G. Strong of Kansas, in House, June 4, 1920, favoring bill to provide adjusted compensation for ex-service men. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 153, pp. 9189-90). Price 20 cents.

Speech by Honorable Charles S. Thomas of Colorado, in Senate, April 29, 1920, opposing bill. (In Congressional Record, Vol. 59, No. 121, pp. 6781-5). Price 8 cents.

IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

(Not in pamphlet form)

Students who have access to the Congressional Record, will find the articles listed above, as well as the following speeches and documents. These documents, in most cases, are not published in pamphlet form. It will be necessary for the student to purchase the entire number of the Congressional Record in order to get the document in question. These numbers may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at the prices indicated:

Volume No. 62, No. 236, September 19, 1922, Soldiers, Adjusted Compensation, etc., 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 237, September 20, 1922, Soldiers' Adjusted Compensation, 11 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 218, August 28, 1922, Compensation for World War Veterans (by various senators), 7 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 218, August 26, 1922, McNary Reclamation Amendment. 7 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 219, August 29, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans, by various senators. 8 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 220, August 30, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans, by various senators. 8 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 221, August 31, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans, by various senators. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 229, September 11, 1922. McNary Amendment to Adjusted Compensation Bill.

Volume No. 62, No. 230, September 12, 1922. Librarian Loan (Soldiers' Compensation). 12 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 231, September 13, 1922. Adjusted Compensation Bill. 7 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 232, September 14, 1922. Conference Report on Veterans' Compensation. 14 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 233, September 15, 1922. Conference Report on Veterans' Compensation, including text of Conference report, Land-settlement, etc. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 234, September 16, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 234, September 15, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 234, September 14, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 236, September 19, 1922. First Deficiency Appropriation bill. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 237, September 20, 1922. Compensation of World War Veterans, including text of veto message. 11 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 237, September 20, 1922. Soldiers' Adjusted Compensation. Veto message and statement by disabled American veterans of the World War. 11 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 238, September 21, 1922. Personal explanation, correction; Heflin, Ashurst. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 238, September 21, 1922. American troops in Germany. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 238, September 19, 1922. American troops in Germany. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 238, September 20, 1922. Adjusted compensation bill. 9 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 2, December 6, 1921, Soldiers' Bonus, Gallivan. 5 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 3, December 6, 1921, Same, including speech on McDonogh at Baltimore, Maryland. 7 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 5, December 9, 1921. Soldier benefit legislation. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 14, September 19, 1921. The Lost Battalion. 6 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 16, December 22, 1921. Cash for soldiers' bonus by tax on beer and wine. 8 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 25, January 12, 1922. Readjustment legislation for soldiers, etc. 8 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 31, January 20, 1922. Adjusted compensation bill. 8 cents.

Volume No. 62, No. 32, January 20, 1922. Legislation passed for benefit of ex-service men, etc. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 35, January 24, 1922. Adjustment of foreign Loans. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 37, January 27, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus and Sales Tax. 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 40, January 31, 1922. Adjustment of foreign loans. 11 cents.

Volume 62, No. 44, February 6, 1922. Clothing for Ex-Service Men while Hospital Patients. 15 cents.

Volume 62, No. 50, February 13, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 50, February 13, 1922. Money for Payment of Soldiers' Bonus. 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 51, February 14, 1922. Veterans of World War, Bonus Bill and Republican Incompetency. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 53, February 16, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 54, February 17, 1922. Bonus Legislation (committee action on bill). 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 56, February 20, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 57, February 20, 1922. Soldiers' Compensation Bill, why jeopardize its enactment by an unjust tax provision that is a political and economic liability? 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 60, February 24, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 63, February 27, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus, including declaration by American Federation of Labor on national prohibition. 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 64, February 23, 1922. Funds to pay Soldiers' Bonus, no increase of taxation necessary, etc. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 66, March 2, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus, Gallivan. 12 cents.

Volume 62, No. 70, March 7, 1922. Same, including statistics. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 70, March 7, 1912. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 71, February 22, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus and Allied Indebtedness. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 72, March 9, 1922. Argument against Soldiers' Bonus Bill. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 76, March 14, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus Bill. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 79, March 17, 1922. Same (Fordney bill unsatisfactory to soldier, taxpayer, etc.) 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 82, March 21, 1922. Same. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 84, March 23, 1922. Suspension Day (consideration of Soldiers' Adjusted Compensation Bill, etc.) 14 cents.

Volume 62, No. 85, March 23, 1922. Soldiers' Adjusted Compensation Bill, Bonus or Supposed Bonus Bill. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 86, March 23, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 87, March 23, 1922. Same. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 90, March 23, 1922. Same. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 88, March 23, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for Veterans of World War, Soldiers' Compensation Bill in Wall Street. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 89, March 23, 1922. Same (including excerpts showing that Washington advocated a bonus). 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 91, March 23, 1922. Same. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 92, March 23, 1922. So-called Soldiers' Adjusted Compensation Bill, etc. 11 cents.

Volume 62, No. 93, March 23, 1922. The Bonus Bill, on Adjusted Compensation. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 94, March 23, 1922. Adjusted Compensation. 12 cents.

Volume 62, No. 95, March 23, 1922. Same, for Veterans of World War, no increase of taxation necessary, etc. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 100, April 12, 1922. Bonus Bill. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 102, April 14, 1922. Services for Soldier Dead at Brooklyn, New York. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 105, March 23, 1922. Scraps, Scraps and Mishaps of the Soldiers' Bonus. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 107, March 23, 1922. Adjusted Compensation, including article on Sam Joseph. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 109, April 12, 1922. Same, advance in Government Bonds. 4 cents.

Volume 62, No. 110, March 23, 1922. Same. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 111, April 25, 1922. Same (deliberations in secret sessions). 7 cents.

Volume 62, No. 131, May 16, 1922. Great Britain prepares to pay interest on her foreign debt to United States, etc. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 137, May 25, 1922. Investigation into alleged unlawful hanging of soldiers. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 149, June 8, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for World War Veterans. 10 cents.

Volume 62, No. 153, June 13, 1922. Claims of Ex-Service Men, including list of cases assisted and also pension cases. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 157, June 17, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for World War Veterans. 6 cents.

Volume 62, No. 159, June 20, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for World War Veterans. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 160, June 21, 1922. Same, George Washington's attitude toward a bonus. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 160, June 20, 1922. Adjusted Compensation for World War Veterans. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 162, June 23, 1922. Soldiers' Bonus, George Washington. 9 cents.

Volume 62, No. 163, June 24, 1922. Same, including excerpts from Washington's letter to governors. 8 cents.

Volume 62, No. 166, June 7, 1922. The Soul of the American Soldier, the source of power, upon occasion to visit of 90 blind War Veterans. 13 cents.

Volume 62, No. 167, June 28, 1922. George Washington and the bonus question. 10 cents.

MAGAZINE ARTICLES ON THE BONUS

Articles on the Bonus in the Literary Digest will be found in the following numbers:

March 20, 1920

November 27, 1920

February 28, 1920

February 11, 1922

April 8, 1922

September 30, 1922

July 22, 1922

August 5, 1922

August 19, 1922

September 2, 1922

July 9, 1921

May 15, 1920

July 30, 1921

February 25, 1922

March 18, 1922

July 15, 1922

July 29, 1922

August 12, 1922

August 26, 1922

September 9, 1922

April 22, 1922

Articles on the Bonus in the New Republic will be found in the following numbers.

July 6, 1921	March 24, 1920
April 5, 1922	

Articles on the Bonus in the World's Work will be found in the following numbers:

June, 1920	March, 1922
------------	-------------

Articles on the Bonus in the Outlook will be found in the following numbers:

May 5, 1920	May 26, 1920
July 20, 1921	April 28, 1920
March 1, 1922	March 15, 1922
October 4, 1922	March 22, 1922
July 27, 1921	March 31, 1920
March 8, 1922	February 22, 1922
	September 13, 1922

Articles on the Bonus in the Review of Reviews will be found in the following numbers:

December, 1919	October, 1920
----------------	---------------

Articles on the Bonus in the Independent will be found in the following numbers:

February 4, 1922	January 21, 1922
February 25, 1922	March 11, 1922

Articles on the Bonus in the Review (consolidated with Independent in 1921) will be found in the following numbers:

May 1, 1920	April 10, 1920
-------------	----------------

Articles on the Bonus in the Survey will be found in the following numbers:

May 8, 1920	April 16, 1921
February 26, 1921	

Articles on the Bonus in the Current History (Supplement to New York Times) will be found in the following numbers:

October, 1920	June, 1922
---------------	------------

Articles on the Bonus in Current Opinion will be found in the following number:

March, 1922

Articles on the Bonus in Nation will be found in the following number:

March 1, 1922

PART II

HINTS TO DEBATERS

The following suggestions are intended for those who wish to know just how to proceed in preparing a question for debate and who may not have access to other sources of information. Some space is devoted to the conduct of the debate itself and a certain ethical code involved.

Students who desire a fuller discussion of debating are referred to the following books.

The Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate, V. A. Ketcham, published by the Macmillan Company, New York City.

Argumentation and Debating, William T. Foster, published by Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

Argumentation and Debate, J. Walter Reeves, Published by D. C. Heath and Company, Chicago, Illinois.

The first two books are standard college texts on the subject. Foster's text is perhaps the most complete. Reeves' book is an excellent handbook for high school use.

The first and most important step after you have received the statement of the proposition is to analyze it. By that is meant the separation or division of the proposition into its essential parts and the exclusion from your consideration of all non-essential points or those outside of the specific statement of the proposition. To be able to do this, you must understand what the proposition means. Do not be contented with a vague, indefinite idea, but get a definite grasp of the subject for debate. It may be necessary to use the dictionary for the meanings of individual words; a careful study of the history of the question may clear up the phrasing of the proposition. This requires reading from your bibliography, not for proof of any point—you are not ready for that—but for the historical background of the subject which includes its origin, its development and progress and the reason for its discussion at the present time.

However, as soon as you begin reading you should begin thinking. Your next step is to analyze the subject still further to find the issues or the essential points over which there is dis-

agreement. This step which leads to the issues is by far the most important and the most difficult one because here you determine what the points are you must prove. If you overlook one essential point or leave it out of your consideration altogether thru careless and faulty analysis, you are doomed to become the prey of all opponents who have taken the measure of your weakness. Too much care cannot be taken to be sure that you have drawn from the mass of your reading about the question the essential points in dispute. As noted above, this thinking about your issues should begin with your reading. For, in the origin and history of the question, they are revealed.

Meanwhile, as you read, all evidence which may have a direct or an indirect bearing upon the debates should be recorded and saved for future reference.

Valuable time will be saved and a great amount of extra work as well, if the debater will follow a systematic method in his preparation. Making a record of evidence is perhaps the most important part of a systematic study.

If high school debaters are weak in any one thing, it is the lack of proof or evidence to support the statements offered. Many times debates consist of unsupported assertions. The high school student apparently is of the opinion that if he believes that a thing is true and asserts that it is true, then it must be so. As a result, debates often degenerate to the ridiculous position of the two small boys who argue, "Tis!" "Taint!" Such argument supported only with the reason popularly attributed to women "because," which is not confined to their sex alone, will always go down before an array of facts and indisputable proof. Therefore, it is most essential that the debater have proof for his statements.

Proof consists of evidence of which there are two kinds: (1) evidence from fact, and (2) evidence from authority. The former is more difficult to get, while the latter is less reliable and therefore more easily overthrown. A fact is a statement of a condition or situation which is commonly recognized or accepted as true. "The price of admission to the football game this afternoon is fifty cents" is a fact recognized and accepted

by all the students. They would expect to have to pay that amount if they attended and would actually do so.

There are many facts surrounding every debatable question, but the proposition itself is an assertion which requires the support of facts to stand as a fact itself. Since it is a debatable question with the affirmative and negative about equally balanced, it is very improbable that the proposition can ever be established as a fact, at least during the progress of a single debate. However, if later the thing proposed, for example, adjusted compensation, is passed because the great majority of the people think it should be done, then the proposition is no longer debatable and is an established fact as long as the greater number of people recognize and accept it. But questions of right and justice, of policy or expediency can not be established as absolute and incontrovertible facts because they must of necessity be confined to the limits of human experience. Later experience may prove our former conclusions all wrong. For example, suppose the soldiers are granted adjusted compensation; later experience may show that it was a mistake and disprove the conclusion which up to that time had been accepted as a fact. Our principles of democratic government are but theories accepted by us as sound and true because as far as our experience goes, they have proved more satisfactory than any other. A fact differs from a theory in that it is a condition the truth of which can be tested by finite experience. Such evidence is indisputable proof to support debatable points, but it is obvious that all the facts in the case must come into consideration.

Every debatable question has two sides. There is some strength and some weakness in each position or the question is not debatable. The debater's problem is to find that strength and that weakness in a sincere attempt to arrive at the truth. Do not be a coward and try to evade the issue or to argue beside the point or to beg the question. A debater begs the question when he consciously or unconsciously attempts to introduce into his argument as a point of proof an assertion which requires proof under the guise of an accepted fact. For example, in the adjusted compensation argument, if an affirma-

tive speaker argued that the soldier should be given an option of cash, vocational training or farm and home aid and gives as his reason that the Government has a moral obligation to the soldier without first having proved that moral obligation, he is begging the question. For he ignores the debatable nature of his reason and attempts to put an unproved assertion over as a recognized fact.

To evade the issue is to attempt to dodge a difficult point by "stalling" or "beating around the bush," or by intentionally ignoring an essential argument of an opponent.

To argue beside the point is to devote the greater part of your argument to a minor or non-essential point. This may be a means of evasion or it may be due to faulty analysis.

Another common fault of inexperienced debaters is to argue in circles. It is the result of illogical thinking or the inability to see the relationship of cause and effect. It is very often *prima facie* evidence of insincere preparation, but sometimes it is due to poor reasoning. Just what is meant may be made clear by means of an example. Should a debater argue that adjusted compensation should be granted to soldiers because it is a moral obligation of the Government because adjusted compensation should be given them, he would be arguing in a circle for he comes back to the point from which he started.

All of these things are commonly found in high school debates and, indeed, in many collegiate contests. If used intentionally they are dishonorable and tho used unwittingly at times they defeat the real purpose of the debate—namely, to arrive at the truth.

In order to do that, there must be a direct clash of argument. If the proposition has been analyzed correctly, there must be a direct clash of horn on horn. For, in a clearly worded proposition, there can be but one correct interpretation, one sound analysis, certain well-defined issues.

Aside from being unsportsmanlike and dishonorable, side stepping and unsupported assertion is unnecessary. A debater who knows his subject has nothing to fear or to lose by meeting squarely his opponent's argument. For, as has been pointed

out, there is some strength and some weakness to his case. If that is not true he is to be pitied and the one who selected the question is to be blamed. The debater's job is not to ignore the strength of the opponent's argument, but to seek out its weakness, at the same time fortifying himself in the strength of his own case and preparing himself to defend its weakness.

Many debaters experience the difficulty of not being able to see anything left of their own case after an opponent has presented his argument. The opponent seems to have all the strength and the faint heart all of the weakness. Such a mental and moral attitude is the result of one of two things; either the debater has not anticipated the strength of the other side of the case as any careful student of the question ought to have done, or he is a natural coward and lacks the fighter's spirit, the grit and determination to stand his ground and wait for an opportunity to launch a counter attack and thrust at his opponent's weakest front. However, such a boy or girl who is handicapped by a non-assertive spirit need not despair. Face your weakness honestly and squarely and make up your mind that you are going to win out. Determination is half the battle. The other fellow may be in as hard a position as you are. There must be a point that he has overlooked, where his defense is weak. Find it out and press your advantage.

One word of caution, however. Determination does not mean stubbornness nor merely arguing for the sake of argument. These are dangerous pitfalls lying in wait for the debater. Do not be like the man in the rhyme, "Convince a man against his will,—he holds the same opinion still." Be frank and ready to admit the truth of convincing argument. If it is sound, there is no use in battering out your brains in unsuccessful assault. That shows poor judgment, always the case when an individual is ruled by a stubbornness which has no name for defeat. The debater will gain his point and achieve success by conserving his energies and devoting his argument to the strength of his case. Admit the strength of that part of an opponent's argument which is strong enough to stand and

waste no time upon it. Turn to another point and direct your attack as the skillful quarterback would do in directing his offensive against the opposing football team.

Do not be dominated by prejudice and argue just for the sake of argument in order to defend your own unfounded and ungrounded opinions. Approach every question with an open mind, picking out the wheat from the chaff.

If that is the debater's attitude, the question of which side he shall take will not arise because after all, he is looking for the truth. Nevertheless, it is often advisable to take the side of the case toward which your opinions and sympathies tend. However, many debaters who approach a question with honesty and sincerity will change their opinions and sympathies before progressing far and will ask to be permitted to uphold the opposite side.

First, record all the facts you come across that may be of use to you later.

The other kind of evidence is the testimony of authorities. An authority is a man who has expert knowledge upon a particular subject so that his opinions are respected and even accepted as final. In the courtroom, there are two kinds of cases: one the truth of which can be established by the testimony of eye-witnesses and the other where eye-witnesses are lacking and so-called "circumstantial" evidence must be relied upon. In the former, the question in dispute is settled by introducing facts which bear directly upon the case, the things which people heard and saw; in the latter, the circumstances and facts which may have an indirect bearing upon the case are introduced and by piecing them together (reasoning about them) an attempt is made to find the truth and to arrive at a decision.

The requirements of most debate questions are those of the last named type. Most of the available facts have but an indirect relation to the question so that the debater is compelled to establish his case by reasoning about the available facts or by referring to authority. Just as a physician is often summoned into the courtroom to give his medical opinion or the results of his examination and diagnosis, so the financial expert

and many others are called into a debate to give expert testimony. The problem that confronts the debater here is the obtaining of testimony from a man who is recognized and generally accepted as an authority upon the particular question. For just as it is necessary to learn your facts from a reliable source, from a witness that people will believe, so it is essential to produce the opinion of an authority whose position is unquestionable.

Here are a few tests to put to all evidence submitted by so-called authorities:

1. Is the man known and recognized as an authority on this particular subject?
2. Is he in a position to know all the facts?
3. Is he fair-minded or prejudiced?
4. Does he contradict himself?
5. Is he inconsistent?
6. Is he radical or conservative?
7. Is he used as an authority for the opposite side of the case?
8. Are his motives pure?
9. Is he influenced by the pressure of wealth, politics or fame?
10. Is he merely trying to be popular?
11. Are his statements ambiguous or direct and forceful?
12. Does he reveal all the facts or does he ignore or conceal some things?

In your reading on the subject, asking these questions will help to give you a correct estimate of the worth and weight of any man's testimony. A great deal of what you read, therefore, will be of no use to you as evidence except to acquaint you with the whole fund of information concerning the case. This knowledge may serve you well in refuting the argument of an opponent based upon such unreliable authority. As far as the recording of such evidence is concerned, you will have to use your own judgment. The best rule is to save anything which may later prove of use. But if you have the idea that anything that is printed is sacred and inviolable, dispell it forever from

your mind. It is no more so than the spoken word. Therefore, everything that you read should be scrutinized with great care; even this bulletin should be put to the same severe test.

REASONING

However, the testimony of recognized authority is not convincing until it is fitted into the reasoning process as support for certain contentions, suppositions, and premises. After such evidence is introduced, nothing is proved until the debater points out the relationship of cause or effect which exists between the bits of evidence. More debaters fail because of this one lack than any other single fault. The average debater realizes that he must quote the statements of some eminent man, but often he seems to believe that this is all that is required. But argument consists of a clearly defined process of growth or development, the bringing out of existing relationships between related groups of facts and the drawing of a conclusion. Each conclusion reached is larger than the one preceding, and rests upon it for support; each conclusion in turn is a step nearer the final conclusion, which is your proposition itself. Argument then is like a bridge and must be built up step by step, each step serving as a support for the superstructure that rises above it. This will become more clear in the discussion of the brief. First, however, reasoning ought to be defined and explained.

Reasoning is the process of organizing facts into related groups, pointing out that relationship and drawing a conclusion. There are two kinds of reasoning, inductive and deductive. Induction is the process used when you want to establish a general law which will cover all the cases in a given class. This is done by accumulating a large number of facts on a subject, classifying them according to the relation which they bear to each other and from that relationship, formulating a general law. For example, in order to prove that the Government has a moral obligation to adjust the compensation of all soldiers in all wars, it is necessary to assemble a very large group of facts on separate cases before the conclusion desired can be established as a general law.

On the contrary, there are times when it is convenient to prove the fact in a particular case by applying an established law to it. This is reasoning by deduction. For example, after establishing the general law that the Government has a moral obligation to adjust the compensation of all soldiers of all wars it is a simple step in deduction to the conclusion that the Government has a moral obligation to adjust the compensation of all veterans of the World War. (Q. E. D.) In other words, if the particular case in dispute, as adjusted compensation to soldiers in this last war, comes under the class to which a general law applies, then the application of that law to the case in dispute can be used to establish as a fact the contention advanced. The important point to remember, however, is that the general law or principle used must be established beyond question and must be accepted by the majority of thinking people. Otherwise, the application of a false or unsupported law to a particular case does not prove anything.

FALLACIES IN REASONING

Many errors creep into the reasoning of debaters, the one just mentioned being the most common. Next in prevalence, is that of jumping to conclusions, a common habit and weakness of human nature. This may be done in both the inductive and deductive process. In induction, errors of this kind arise either because of an insufficient number of facts or because we assume as a fact that which is merely hearsay or gossip. In deduction, the same error arises when a debater tries to apply a general law to a class which does not come under its provisions or when he has insufficient proof for his particular case. For example, one might apply the general law that all bad boys should be punished, to a particular boy. You would reason that he is a bad boy and therefore he ought to be punished. But before your conclusion will stand you must convince us that he is a bad boy. Try to avoid these common errors in reasoning.

ANALOGY

Another kind of reasoning is that from analogy. An analogy is a known case which resembles an unknown case in all

essential points so that a fact concerning the known case might be inferred concerning the case which has never been tried in actual experience. Many debatable propositions are of such a nature that our conclusions concerning practicability or whether they will work must be reached by inference. Inference depends largely for its support on a known case that is similar in all essential points and has worked. For example, you will find in the affirmative argument in the bulletin the story of two boys working for the same employer. That is an analogy to the situation which exists between the Federal Government and the soldier and his civilian brother. If the analogy is a real one, the essential points in both must be similar. If the two cases are dissimilar in any one essential point, then the analogy will not hold. This, also, is an error in reasoning which should be studiously avoided.

RECORDING EVIDENCE

No doubt, the question arises, what is the most efficient method of recording evidence. The following is the most widely used method and, perhaps, offers more advantages than any other. Each bit of evidence is recorded on a separate card. For convenience in handling, these cards ought to be 3x5 inches. An inexpensive box can be obtained at any book store for filing them alphabetically for ready reference. They may be arranged according to subject or according to the point that they prove. Evidence for both affirmative and negative should be recorded by each debater and the cards may be separated later. That is the foremost advantage of the card system in that the proof may be arranged and rearranged in any order at any time without extra copying. Cards which contain discarded material may be thrown out at any time without disturbing the remainder. The speaker with practice will find it convenient to read his evidence direct from the card rather than to memorize it. In refutation and rebuttal, it makes it possible for the debater to adjust his argument to the necessity of the moment and to draw upon any point he desires.

The general heading or main point in the argument which the bit of evidence supports should be written in the upper left hand corner. The specific point or topic that is covered should be written opposite in the upper right corner. The source, the name of book or magazine, data, volume, page, etc., should be written across the bottom of the card. The quotation itself should be prefaced by the name of the authority, his official position and the occasion of his utterance if that is advisable. A model card follows:

Moral obligation	Soldiers need it
Name, position of authority	
Quotation:	
Source: Am. Legion Weekly	
June 5, 1922, Vol. 2, p. 45	

THE BRIEF

The next step is the organization of the evidence. As you read, the issues should be analyzed in an effort to find out just what things have to be proved in order to prove the main point at issue. The brief or outline is a prime necessity to present graphically the successive steps in analysis. Analysis is the process of breaking a subject up into its units or essential parts. This is necessary in debate in order to get down to a point small enough to permit of adequate proof. If several of these smaller points can be proved, the whole case can be proved by tracing out the proper relationship which they bear to each other and to the main proposition. The problem is to find what those smaller points are and to establish a logical relationship of cause and effect with the main point at issue. In other words, the analysis of the issues for debate is the reasoning process reversed.

Moreover, the brief is a graphic representation of the relationship which exists between the different steps in the argument.

Consequently, the brief is worked out so that each sub-point becomes the reason or the support in turn for each larger point until a point is reached which can be proved and supported by evidence either from fact or from authority. This relationship will be at once apparent when you examine the model brief on adjusted compensation. Then, when the debater presents his case he begins in the reverse order and proves the sub-point first, the proof of which supports his main point which in turn supports his whole proposition. Thus, a debate is built up as a systematic structure resting upon a common foundation and depending for its total strength upon the soundness of each part as in the case of a steel bridge.

PRESENTING THE DEBATE

Observe the following suggestions:

1. Be sure to address the chairman before beginning your speech.
2. Be courteous to the judges by addressing them, Honorable Judges.
3. Address your opponents also. Use this order in opening, "Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opponents, Ladies and Gentlemen."
4. This formal address should be omitted before a rebuttal speech.
5. Always refer to your opponents impersonally as "My worthy opponent."
6. Refer to your teammate in the same way, "the first speaker on the affirmative" or "my honorable colleague."
7. Be courteous to your opponents. Always act as a gentleman or as a lady.
8. Never be personal or make uncomplimentary comments upon your opponent's manner of speaking, his stage presence or his dress. You are not discussing your opponent but his argument.
9. Be sparing in your use of sarcasm and ridicule. Be sure that it carries no offense to the opponent, any members of the audience or the judges.
10. Strive to use tact rather than overbearing domination.

11. Avoid dogmatic or bigoted statements or a manner which might be misinterpreted.
12. Be considerate of the beliefs, prejudices and feelings of those present.
13. Do not beg the question or evade the challenge of an opponent.
14. Do not let your desire to win the decision get ahead of your desire for sincerity and truth. It may mean your undoing.
15. Stop immediately when time is called. You can avoid running over by timing your speech in practice and by arranging a system of warnings with your colleague or the time keeper.
16. Do not depend upon high sounding oratory, but place your trust in simple, straightforward discussion and argument.
17. An oratorical appeal may come at the end, but it should be brief and to the point.
18. Never stop without a recapitulation and summary. Do not introduce new arguments in the summary.
19. Each succeeding speaker after the first one should open his arguments with refutation of the argument of the preceding opponent.
20. Never ignore an opponent's argument or pass it up as of no consequence and go on with your constructive speech without devoting some attention to it.
21. Do not betray in your attitude at any time that you have the superior argument and that the decision is yours. Such cocksureness ruins an otherwise effective argument and may lose the decision for you. Besides, it shows poor manners to anticipate by look or act the decision of the judges.
22. When the decision is announced whether you have won or lost, immediately cross to your opponents and shake hands, congratulating them if they have won, expressing your appreciation of their efforts if they have lost.

Note: It is advisable to have the teams seated at separate tables upon the platform. The visiting team should be given the better table. The affirmative usually takes the table on the speaker's right.

Ref

